Senate resume consideration of the Clean Air Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. Immediately after the prayer the Senate will resume consideration of S. 3219, at which time the pending question will be on the adoption of the amendment by Mr. HART of Colorado, amendment No. 1608. There is a time limitation debate on that amendment. I believe that is the amendment on which there is an hour and a half limitation. Upon the disposition of that amendment No. 1608, and that disposition will be by rollcall vote, the yeas and nays having already been ordered thereon, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the amendment by Mr. HART of Colorado, amendment No. 1609. There is a 1-hour time limitation on that amendment. Upon the disposition of that amendment, the Senate will take up the amendment by Mr. PACKWOOD and Mr. BUMPERS on which there is a one and a half hour time limitation.

At no later than 1:45 p.m. tomorrow the Senate will vote on final passage of S. 3219, the Clean Air Act. Upon the disposition of the Clean Air Act, the Senate will resume consideration of the tax reform bill, and there will be votes throughout the afternoon and evening on amendments and motions in relation to the same.

It is anticipated, and I think I ought to emphasize this, that the Senate will go very late tomorrow evening again on the tax reform bill in an effort to act finally on the bill on Friday.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. The program recited by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has already been agreed to in consent request; is that correct?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes, the Senator is correct.

ORDER TO HOLD H.R. 12944 AT DESK

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 12944, to extend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, for 6 months, be held at the desk pending further disposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, and pursuant to Senate Resolution 509, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative from Missouri, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 11:15 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Thursday, August 5, 1976, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 4, 1976:

IN THE JUDICIARY

John H. Moore II, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida, vice Peter T. Fay, elevated.

Sidney M. Aronovitz, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida, vice William O. Mehrtens, retired.

Harry W. Wellford, of Tennessee, to be U.S. circuit judge for the sixth circuit, vice William E. Miller, deceased.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Denis-James J. Downey, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Rear Adm. Clarence R. Bryan, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties of great importance and responsibility commensurate with the grade of vice admiral within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Samuel L. Gravely, Jr., U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 4, 1976:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Stephen Low, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zambia.

Nancy V. Rawls, of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Ignacio E. Lozano, Jr., of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Hung Wai Ching, of Hawaii, to be a Governor of the U.S. Postal Service for the remainder of the term expiring December 8, 1981.

Robert L. Hardesty, of Texas, to be a Governor of the U.S. Postal Service for the term expiring December 8, 1983.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John A. Penello, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring August 27, 1981.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitments to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE DINGELL-BROYHILL (TRAIN) AUTO EMISSION CONTROL AMENDMENT: A RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIVE PAUL ROGERS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1976

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the whip notice for legislative work on the House floor this week, August 2 through August 6, notes the long delayed Clean Air Act amendments, H.R. 10498, scheduled for debate to begin Wednesday, August 4. The Rules Committee appropriately adopted a rule for 3 hours of debate with an open rule for amendments on this controversial legislation.

I am pleased this bill finally is moving as the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee "ordered the bill reported" as far back as March 18, 1976.

Congressman JIM BROYHILL and I are offering an amendment on the automobile emission section, title II, section 203. Our emission control amendment contains standards recommended to Congress by Administrator Train of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. It has his full support and that of his agency which is charged with administration of pollution controls. We have published and circulated evidence to our colleagues which calls for adoption of the Train recommendations. Our amendment provides for the best possible balance of cleaner air, automobile fuel conservation, and major consumer purchase and maintenance savings. It is the most sensible approach demanding enactment. It carries economic protections for the Nation.

However, Representative PAUL ROGERS, who last year steered the original bill to the Commerce Committee, attacked the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) emission control standards in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 26, 1976, on three principal, but misleading grounds:

1. "The Dingell amendment unreasonably exaggerates the fuel economy impacts and costs of the emission standards contained in the committee bill.

2. "The Dingell amendment is based on a misleading analysis of the health effects of auto emissions. And,

3. "The Dingell amendment would give the auto companies a new chance to lobby against the standards in 1979. It would remove all incentive for continued research, development, and procurement of new emission systems."

Representative ROGERS then submitted his "proof" for each of those three statements. This paper I am inserting today is the response to those assertions presented by him. First. Strongely, Representative ROGERS complains about the advantageous fuel savings of the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment compared to the grave fuel penalties that would occur under the committee bill standards. In referring to the joint interagency Department of Transportation, Environmental Protection Agency, and Federal Energy Administration report of April

1976 on auto emission schedules then published, including our amendment, ROGERS states that I have identified only the "worst case," that the worst case is unrealistically pessimistic, and that the DOT–EPA–FEA study admits that the low range estimate is an unrealistic worst cast.

Rebuttal: In fact, the DOT–EPA–FEA study did not call the low range an "unrealistic worst case." It reflected the present bounds of current technology without estimating the potential of unproved systems that "may be made and used in later years." Such technology would be used (1) if it was available, (2) if it was proven by field tests, and (3) if it was affordable. It does not seem "selective" to use such estimates to gage near term effects on fuel economy, costs, and other economic effects. At least such estimates contain more known factors than speculative estimates based upon unestablished emission control technologies.

We must not forget that just last year, we passed a law that requires the auto companies to improve the fuel economy of their cars by substantial margins in a very short time. It is not enough, therefore, for auto companies to hold their own in fuel economy while they reach for more and more stringent emission standards. That seems to be what Representative ROGERS suggests when he argues that automakers could minimize the fuel economy loss if they adopt the best technology for controlling emission standards. Rather, they must improve the average fuel economy by almost 100 percent.

Second. Mr. ROGERS also discusses this fuel economy argument with the conclusion that the automakers can meet the committee bill standards in 1980 if they are willing to use the best technology available for 1980.

Rebuttal: This "selectively" misquotes the EPA letter referred to in the previous paragraph, which reads potentially available. Again, the potential availability includes field test and cost consideration. Mr. ROGERS bridges a long chasm by the thinnest of ropes when he changes technology "potentially available" to "best available."

The Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment would not remove the incentive for automakers to adopt the best available technology for controlling emissions. In fact, they would continue to have every bit as much incentive for introducing new and improved technology under the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) proposal as they would under any proposal under consideration. Furthermore, our amendment would not rule out the diesel and CVCC alternative engines as would the standards favored by Representative ROGERS. What our proposal does is recognize the fuel economy standards which Congress adopted last year and attempt to responsibly match the emission standards to that schedule for fuel economy improvements, clean air improvements, and consumer savings.

Third. In his fuel economy argument and elsewhere throughout the text, Representative ROGERS misrepresents the Volvo test. He states that—

The 1977 California Volvo cars have shown that the 0.4 NO_x standard could be met in 1977 while achieving a 10% fuel economy improvement.

Rebuttal: In fact, the Volvo test cars in question in California have not yet been certified by EPA. And if they are, they will be certified to only 1977 California standards (.4/9/1.5), not to statutory standards. Volvo has stated that the durability vehicle failed to meet Federal statutory standard requirements for either the CO or NO_x. Further, the fuel economy gain is certainly exaggerated in its inference. The gain was actually in comparison to a 1976 Volvo, which did not have good fuel economy in comparison to competitive vehicles. The addition of an oxygen catalyst in 1975 and 1976 brought even more dramatic fuel economies to domestic cars. Thus, any effort to assert a similar fuel economy gain to other models already using catalysts is inappropriate.

Additionally, Representative ROGERS' claim that the three-way catalyst system used on one model of Volvo sold in California would "prove" that technology is available to meet statutory auto emission standards without fuel economy penalties, is simply not so. As I further indicated in my letter of July 23 to all Members of the House, the fuel economy of the Volvo equipped with the three-way catalyst is inferior to that of a number of domestic cars of comparable size and weight. In his reference to Volvo, Representative ROGERS has relied on the misleading data and opinions supplied by the California Air Resources Board, which even Volvo admits is grossly in error.

Fourth. Also in his fuel economy argument, Representative ROGERS infers that the committee's bill suspension process would take care of any problems that might arise with respect to fuel penalties related to NO_x standards.

Rebuttal: We must take issue with this argument on several grounds. First, the suspension process is a costly and even counterproductive measure. At best it will keep everyone in business while negotiations for a reprieve are undertaken. It does not allow sufficient lead-time, particularly as the manufacturers attempt to meet the substantial fuel economy requirements enacted last year. Manufacturers will be unlikely to try new technology that might be obsolete within a year or two, depending on suspension decisions. And, suspension or not, the 0.4 NO_x remains in the committee bill as a requirement for model year 1985, which automatically precludes some promising fuel efficient alternate engine technologies, such as CVCC, diesel and lean-burn. I will discuss alternate engine technologies in more detail at another point in this paper.

Fifth. Finally, with respect to the fuel economy argument we must take issue, if not offense, at Representative ROGERS' claim that the committee bill "requires the automakers to show that the standards need to be relaxed to save fuel" while the Dingell amendment "would relax the standards without requiring the automakers to back up their claims."

Rebuttal: Representative ROGERS argues inconsistently. He claims large health benefits would be derived from the committee version, as opposed to the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment, but then extols his bill for permitting those health benefits to be laid aside if there is a 10 percent fuel economy penalty associated with the 0.4 NO_x standard. The Dingell-Broyhill amendment would not relax the NO_x standard but instead leave the decision on the final NO_x level to the EPA, the government research and enforcement agency with the most expertise in the field of auto emission control standards and clean air health requirements. If the health benefits are substantial between 1982 and 1985, the Dingell-Broyhill amendment does not make the enjoyment of them contingent on fuel economy.

As I will again note later, there is serious reason to doubt whether the 0.4 NO_x level is necessary in any time frame. Surely we are not prepared to cross off technology options, run the consumer's cost up millions of dollars, and waste energy without further study of whether this level is needed and practicable.

Sixth. Representative ROGERS' next accusation of misrepresentation is based on the premise that 0.4 NO_x is now feasible.

Rebuttal: The arguments Representative ROGERS uses to back up technological feasibility are themselves a series of misrepresentations. First, he states that Volvo "proved that its 3-way catalyst equipped 1977 California 3,500-pound car could meet all three statutory emission standards, including the NO_x standard for 50,000 miles * * *" As we stated before, this simply is not true. Second, he mentions that a Honda CVCC is able to achieve statutory standards. There have been no published reports of this. Certainly, it cannot achieve these standards under certification procedures. Indeed, in the Honda status report to EPA in December 1975, they indicated they would not know the potential for 0.4 NO_x until the end of 1976. Furthermore, they indicated their projection that a 0.4 NO_x could be achieved only by ignoring fuel economy and driveability considerations. Third, he indicates that the Ford Stirling can meet all three standards. Ultimately this may prove to be an accurate forecast, but at this time the Stirling is a promising concept still in the development stage. Application—if proven to be mass produceable—will occur only in a time frame well past that of the committee bill. A study by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory supports this statement.

To comment further and to emphasize: It is misleading to conclude, as Representative ROGERS has done, that the CVCC engine, the Stirling engine, or "other technologies" are available to meet the statutory standards. In fact, continued insistence on the statutory standards—particularly the NO_x standard which Representative ROGERS singles out for special attention—discourages investment in—and could very well rule out—both the CVCC engine and the diesel.

We do know that diesel engines that can be put into production in the near future offer substantial fuel economy advantages but they would be ruled out by

the 0.4 NO_x standard favored by Representative ROGERS.

Seventh. In continuing the technological feasibility argument, Representative ROGERS quotes analyses by the Dean of the University of Michigan's School of Engineering indicating that the committee's bill's emission standards are "feasible from an engineering standpoint in the time frame specified."

Rebuttal: I cannot believe that the distinguished dean means to include 0.4 NO_x in this statement. Based partly on his counsel the UAW originally called for a 5-year pause at interim emission levels and recently opposed Senator HART's amendment on the Senate side, which seeks to reestablish the 0.4 NO_x level in the Senate bill. If he was referring to the timing of the other standards, we have not argued that they are not feasible from an engineering standpoint given sufficient time, but rather that the accelerated schedule of the committee bill will lock in certain technologies and cost the consumer in lost fuel economy and unnecessarily increased costs of crash programs.

Eighth. The comment that "if the foreign manufacturers can meet the standards, why cannot the giant domestic auto companies with all their resources do so?" cannot go uncontested.

Rebuttal: No manufacturer, domestic or foreign, has certified a vehicle at statutory standards. Volvo came close to meeting those standards on one small, 4-cylinder engine but has stated it is not optimistic for its V-6. I assume Congress is not yet ready to restrict the American public to only that sized vehicle even if it is eventually able to meet such levels.

Ninth. With further respect to technological feasibility, Representative ROGERS quotes the California ARB as estimating "that by 1981 all cars could use the 3-way system to meet 0.4 gpm NO_x * * *".

Rebuttal: Again, I repeat that the technological feasibility of 0.4 NO_x has not been demonstrated. Further, evidently ARB is willing for the Congress to take on itself the uncertainties of this technology, but we are not. The applicability of 3-way technology to larger engines has not been demonstrated, nor has the 3-way catalyst had any demonstration of its practicality in field use.

Tenth. Representative ROGERS calls the Dingell analysis of the costs of the committee bill mistaken.

Rebuttal: The two premises that he uses to support his arguments we have already countered: First, that the fuel penalty is overstated, and second, the criticism of using the low-range (proven technology) estimate. In addition, we can only point out that to require across the board and prematurely a technology that has not yet been proven incurs a substantial risk of sizable increased operating and initial costs for the consumer.

Eleventh. Representative ROGERS' statements on health take the arbitrary stand that cleaner is better."

Rebuttal: Representative ROGERS cites a number of preliminary studies and tentative conclusions, some of which are viewed as "red herrings" by the scientific community. We counter by citing some crudite studies on the other side of the fence.

There have been some serious questions raised concerning the need for the statutory NO_x standard. In fact, the U.S. Senator who is most often credited with authorizing the statutory standards has acknowledged that the "technical data supported a relaxation of the standard for oxides of nitrogen from 0.4 gpm to 1 gpm. The auto emission standards were set in 1970 on the basis of information then available on the relationship between auto emissions and air quality. Since that time, new information has come to light that casts doubt on the need for such stringent standards. First, the NO_2 ambient measurement techniques were found to be in error, and instead of 43 regions being in violation of the NO_2 ambient standards, less than 10 were found to be a problem. Second, a study by a panel of the Committee on Motor Vehicles of the National Academy of Sciences concluded, "present Federal emission requirements for .41 gm/mi (HC) and .4 gm/mi (NO_x) seem more restrictive than need be by a factor of about three. Based on the state of knowledge now available, the California 1975–76 standards * * * seem more nearly what is required." Third, a 1975 Yale Medical School study concluded that the CO and NO_x standards were too stringent by a factor of four. Fourth, a study undertaken by Columbia University, MIT, and Harvard for the National Science Foundation concluded that, "Recent corrections to measurements of ambient NO_2 levels indicate that the statutory NO_x emission standard may be more stringent than is necessary to achieve NO_2 ambient air quality standards nationwide in 1985."

Further, in his health arguments Representative ROGERS justifies the 0.4 NO_x based on a 1 hour NO_x standard. The committee bill requires EPA to promulgate a 1 hour NO_x standard unless they find it is not needed for health reasons. Representative ROGERS assumes that EPA will determine such a standard is needed and then goes on to postulate—without evidence—that a 0.4 NO_x automotive standard will be needed to meet this standard.

Also, it is noteworthy that the DOT-EPA-FEA study found virtually no differences, insofar as health effects are concerned, between the emission control schedule in the committee bill and the schedule that would be established by our amendment. Furthermore, the degree of uncertainty as to health effects is so great, and the health effect differences between the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment and the committee bill are so small that it can only be concluded that there are no health effects differences. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 27, 1976 pages 11430–36.)

The interagency study discusses the uncertainty associated with health effects projections:

. . . There is a high degree of uncertainty in making both air quality and health impact projections. The data base is limited and in some cases still subject to scientific debate, and the methodologies are subject to additional development. As a result, the estimates below may well be too high or too low, and they may vary relative to each other.

The National Academy of Sciences, which also studied the question of the adequacy of the automotive standards, confirmed that: "the uncertainty of the estimate is large and nothing is to be gained by pretending to a spacious accuracy not based on real knowledge." NAS further conceded that the "greatest uncertainties attached to emissions that are predominantly produced by the automobile."

Twelfth. Representative ROGERS states that the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment "simply provides relaxation of the auto NO_x standard regardless of what happens to stationary source controls or the public health."

Rebuttal: Obviously, the Dingell-Broyhill amendment is to title II. It does not disturb the provision made by the committee in title I for stationary sources. Automobiles are already controlled to a greater degree than are other contributors, especially stationary sources. Further, Dingell-Broyhill does not relax NO_x standards, but instead provides for phasing in more stringent standards on a realistic timetable.

Thirteenth. The closing statement of Representative ROGERS talks about the hidden significance" of the Dingell amendment.

Rebuttal: To Representative ROGER's concern about eliminating 0.4 NO_x as a "research target", I would counter that it is a research target that the economy and the consumers may not be able to afford, that will detract from fuel economy efforts, that may preclude technologies, and that may not be necessary for public health.

Representative ROGERS' concern about striking "good faith" is unfounded. This principle is only needed when there is an application from the Clean Air Act to suspend the statutory standard—a part of the committee bill which I consider expensive and possibly counterproductive. Obviously no option of meeting 1.0 NO_x at 100,000 miles was included because the Dingell-Broyhill amendment leaves the final NO_x standard to the decision of the Administrator of EPA under the prevailing procedures which call for emission control systems which are effective over the useful life of the vehicle.

In summary, the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment has been offered as part of a reasoned and balanced program to achieve a number of goals simultaneously. It would:

Provide for accelerated but orderly progress in cleaning up automotive emissions to the atmosphere. There would be virtually no difference between the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment and the Committee bill insofar as health effects are concerned.

Recognize the consensus of the scientific community and the EPA that the automotive standard for control of NO_x is more stringent than required for health protection and was established in error. It puts determination of the final level of NO_x control in the hands of the EPA experts.

Encourage domestic auto manufacturers to go forward with their plans to introduce alternative engines, particularly diesel engines which offer fuel economy savings of upwards of 25 percent.

Save enormous quantities of fuel—as much as 9.27 billion gallons between 1977 and 1985, compared to the standards in the Committee bill. (This is according to the April 1976 DOT–EPA–FEA auto emission analysis.)

Save consumers billions of dollars in added cost for fuel, emission control equipment and maintenance. Between 1977 and 1985 the Committee bill would cost consumers as much as $22.3 billion more than the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) standards. (This is according to the April 1976 DOT–EPA–FEA auto emission analysis.)

Provide auto manufacturers an opportunity to meet the fuel economy standards that Congress mandated last year and thus fit with the energy conservation goals enacted by Congress.

I share with Representative ROGERS a strong desire to clean up the air of the Nation. But Members of Congress must not consider auto emission control in isolation from considerations of fuel economy, consumer cost and the health of the Nation's economy. The Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment has been carefully drafted to achieve continued progress in auto emission control while also balancing those other important factors.

While my distinguished colleague has referred to some of my statements as exaggerated, selective, and misleading, I am afraid I would instead apply some of these adjectives to his attack on the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment. In my opinion, the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment presents the best deal for the consumer and the economy, and I believe the facts support this opinion. I urge every Member of Congress to support the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment.

OLYMPIC CONGRATULATIONS EXTENDED

HON. W. G. (BILL) HEFNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, now that the XXI Olympic games are over, I would like to congratulate all of the athletes, coaches, trainers, and others who assisted in representing the United States so well over the past 2 years.

In particular, I would like to express my great appreciation to Mr. Dean Smith, who coached the U.S. basketball team to an Olympic gold medal. As a longtime follower of Atlantic Coast Conference basketball, I have always admired Coach Smith's poise and creativity in leading the University of North Carolina Tar Heels to success. He has continually brought national recognition to the University of North Carolina's basketball program and to the State of North Carolina itself.

In his tenure as head basketball coach at Carolina, Coach Smith has maintained one of the highest winning percentages of any coach in the Nation. Having worked with numerous All-Americans at the University of North Carolina, Coach Smith was well equipped to coordinate the Nation's best basketball talent in the Olympic games.

I am glad that we in North Carolina have had the opportunity to share Coach Smith's knowledge and expertise with the entire country, and gain the gold medal which goes with the title of the greatest amateur basketball team in the world.

Once again, I would like to extend my heartiest congratulations to Dean Smith for the excellent job he has done and the gentlemanly style he has displayed in his profession.

FOURTH OF JULY BICENTENNIAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, our Nation celebrated a gala Fourth of July weekend which gave appropriate recognition to the momentous milestone of 200 years as a free Republic.

President Ford presented a thoughtful Bicentennial message on July 3 in the Cabinet room, in which he summed up the essence of our greatness as a nation as being the dedication to individual rights. As many of my colleagues were out of town, I herewith ask permission to insert the President's inspiring remarks in the RECORD. Text of the message is as follows:

[Office of the White House Press Secretary]

FOURTH OF JULY BICENTENNIAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

Two hundred years ago we, the people of the United States of America, began a great adventure which stirred the imagination and quickened the hopes of men and women throughout the world. The date was July 4, 1776. The occasion, the signing of our Declaration of Independence.

No other nation in history has ever dedicated itself more specifically nor devoted itself more completely to the proposition that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with such unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Two centuries later, as we celebrate our Bicentennial year of Independence, the great American adventure continues. The hallmark of that adventure has always been an eagerness to explore the unknown, whether it lay across an ocean or a continent, across the vastness of space or the frontiers of human knowledge. Because we have always been ready to try new and untested enterprises in government, in commerce, in the arts and sciences and in human relations, we have made unprecedented progress in all of these fields.

While reaching for the unknown, Americans have also kept their faith in this wisdom and experience of the past. Colonists and immigrants brought with them cherished values and ideals in religion and in culture, in law and learning which, mixed with the native American ways, gave us our rich American heritage.

The unique American union of the known and the unknown, the tried and the untried has been the foundation for our liberty and the secret of our great success. In this country individuals can be the masters rather than the helpless victims of their destiny. We can make our own opportunities and make the most of them.

In the space of two centuries we have not been able to right every wrong, to correct every injustice, to reach every worthy goal, but for 200 years we have tried and we will continue to strive to make the lives of individual men and women in this country and on this earth better lives—more hopeful and happy, more prosperous and peaceful, more fulfilling and more free. This is our common dedication and it will be our common glory as we enter the third century of the American adventure.

UNITED STATES MUST SUPPORT SOUTH KOREA

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, in the Monday, July 26, edition of the Birmingham News there appeared an editorial entitled "The Repression Gambit." In detail this editorial outlines the reasons why we must not let South Korea down, and examines the repression ploy the liberals are using against South Korea. Because I feel this is one of the most intelligent, convincing, well-written and relevant discussions of United States-South Korea relations, I am happy to insert that editorial at this point in the RECORD:

THE REPRESSION GAMBIT

One way or another the charge of "repression" or "authoritarianism" or "corruption" has been used against every government opposed by Communists in the history of the Red movement.

The charge was used against Chiang Kai-shek's Chinese government; it was used against successive Vietnamese leaders; it was used against Cambodia's Lon Nol; it was used against Franco; and it is being used against Chile, the Philippines and South Korea.

It may be that a measure of truth adds credibility to each charge. But there are degrees of repression, authoritarianism, etc., and the ultimate loss of freedom is under the alternative of Communism.

South Korea, specifically, is under attack now. Some members of Congress want to cut off military assistance to the government of President Park Chung Hee. The House on June 2 reversed an earlier vote by the International Relations Committee which had favored cutting aid to South Korea. Undoubtedly the issue will arise again.

Eventually the South Koreans will be self-sufficient militarily. Until then, assistance by the U.S. helps deter Communist aggression. If this country doesn't prematurely sink that country, eventually it will be able to swim by itself.

It is easy for people in this country to be critical of the government of South Korea. But if we were separated only by a demilitarized border from a hostile enemy—say the Soviet Union—which continually made threats, constantly sent agents into our country to spy and subvert our citizens, and which vowed the ultimate destruction of our way of life, we might not be as open as we are or as tolerant of dissent of our government.

To a nation, the first order of priority is survival. It is not difficult to understand why in South Korea all the trappings of democracy might be an unaffordable luxury.

And if we establish rules of the game which rule out tough internal security measures, we force South Korea to open itself to the enemy.

It should be kept in mind also that it is pressure from the Communists which makes the security measures necessary—and that the Communists are the first to charge their targets of aggression with "repression" if their subversion is checked.

Even though President Park has taken unto himself vast emergency powers, his people have much more freedom than they would have under communism; and the consensus in South Korea is solidly against communism. We would be doing no one in South Korea a favor if we limited or cut off aid.

CAPTAIN RUSSO RETIRES FROM UTICA POLICE DEPARTMENT AFTER 27 YEARS

HON. DONALD J. MITCHELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the many friends and neighbors of Capt. Nicholas D. Russo in congratulating him on his retirement from the Utica Police Department after 27 years of dedicated service.

Captain Russo's devotion and hard work have earned him the respect and admiration of the people of Utica. He has dedicated a productive professional career to enforcing the law and protecting the people.

Captain Russo began his career with the Utica Police Department as a patrolman in 1948. His abilities and dedication were apparent from the beginning and so it was natural that they be properly recognized. Promotions came—first to detective rank, then lieutenant, and finally captain.

In addition to being noted as an outstanding law enforcement official, Captain Russo is also well known throughout the community for his contributions to various civic and religious organizations. His kindness, compassion, and leadership are highly commendable. We owe a great deal of thanks to a man who has given so much of his time to serving others. That is part of the greatness of America—people giving of themselves to others.

As if that were not enough, Captain Russo is a member of the Knights of Columbus, the Blessed Sacrament Church, and the Blessed Sacrament Men's Club.

He is a member of the Police Benevolent Holy Name Society and is a board member of the City of Utica Youth Bureau. He serves as chairman of the board of directors of the John E. Creedon Police Benevolent Association, is vice commander of the John Phelen Police and Fire Veterans Organization and is vice president of the Columbia Association of Italian Descent. He is chairman of the local Association for Retarded Children and coaches the St. Anthony semipro football team.

Captain Russo is the founder and president of the St. Anthony's Athletic Youth Organization and is vice commander of Stars and Stripes Chapter 82, Disabled American Veterans.

The kind of energy, compassion and devotion which Captain Russo has repeatedly exhibited over the past years is certainly worthy of our heartiest thanks. He is a man of character whose contributions to his community and his country deserve our deepest gratitude.

REGIONALISM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, for some time Hoosiers have been concerned about the flow of Federal dollars from Indiana to other States. Two examples confirm these concerns:

Federal spending nationwide is $1,412 per person, but it is only $1,027 in Indiana for each Hoosier; and

For each tax dollar sent to Washington, Hoosiers received only 73 cents in return.

Midwesterners have become painfully aware that Federal tax and spending policies are causing a massive flow of dollars from the Midwest and the Northeast to the South and to the West. Indiana is among the States that are hurt the most by this outflow. This heavy flow of Federal dollars is away from the States of the Nation under the most severe economic strains, where population is stagnant, unemployment and taxes are high, and personal income is falling. For example, Federal nonmilitary payrolls are often three to four times higher in booming States like Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado than in stable or declining States like New York, Ohio, and Illinois.

Indiana is not at the bottom on the list ranking the States according to the amount of money received for each tax dollar sent to Washington, but it is not too far from it, ranking fifth from the bottom after Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, and Iowa. Indiana lags behind the national average per capita Federal spending on defense contracts and salaries, retirement and welfare payments, but runs about even on highway and sewer programs. When compared to other States in the Great Lakes region, Indiana does fairly well in getting its share of Federal spending, except for welfare payments where it ranks third from the bottom in the Nation.

The political ramifications of this outflow of Federal dollars from Indiana, the Midwest, and the Northeast are significant, and may even be explosive. Already some national commentators are talking about a "second war between the States." There is trouble in the making if some regions flourish while others stagnate. No one argues that Federal policies have caused the economic boom in the South and the West and the decline in the Northeast, but Federal spending patterns are more and more frequently mentioned as one important reason for the economic problems of these regions. Obviously other reasons for the shift are important, ranging from population trends, lower wages and taxes, to cheaper energy, and land. But whatever the reasons the rise of the South and the West is apparent. In each recession since the 1960's unemployment for the Northeast and the Great Lakes region has risen more precipitously and dropped more slowly than in other regions of the country.

The impact of these trends is beginning to register in the Congress. Congressmen from the Northeast and the Midwest are seeking changes in Federal policies that operate at the expense of their regions. The New England States are probably better organized in the Congress to counter these trends than other deficit regions, including the Midwest. It may be that eventually a loose coalition of States from Wisconsin to Maine will have to be formed to protect the interest of these States in securing Federal money.

Federal policies must begin to take into account the vast differences in the economic health of the varying regions of the Nation, and the impact of Federal economic policies on regional economies. Those policies cannot completely offset the effects of economic decline in any one region, but flexible Federal policies could help arrest the downward spiral in the declining regions' economies. Federal tax, expenditure, credit, and employment policies can be influential factors affecting the health of local economies.

Today neither the overall fiscal and monetary policies of the Nation nor specific programs of the Federal Government are designed to respond to the widely varying economic conditions of separate regions of the country. While the Northeast and the Midwest have experienced significant declines in relative economic growth, Federal programs have been heavily weighted toward the South and the West, the regions to which the jobs and wealth have shifted.

To achieve the goal of a balanced economy, we must become aware that a problem of regionalism exists and that regional Federal policies can be devised to alleviate it. In areas of chronic unemployment, efforts to concentrate Federal contracts, payroll expenditures, public works and jobs, and to spur private investment can create jobs, and halt the deterioration of public services. Regional development banks can make low interest loans to businesses in chronically depressed areas and Federal grant formulas can be changed.

The solution to regional imbalances will not come quickly, but many things can be done with good management and without expansion of present programs. My judgment is that in the years immediately ahead great efforts will go into improving our information on regional economies and discussing methods of attacking these problems, and it is abundantly clear that Hoosiers have a great deal to gain from such efforts.

TELEPHONE TERMINAL AND STATION EQUIPMENT

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the individual States should have jurisdiction over telephone terminal and station equipment matters, including the

right to determine the nature and extent to which customer-provided equipment is to be interconnected with the telephone system.

I have this day introduced legislation to assure that the States have such jurisdiction.

State regulatory commissions, in my judgment, are in a better position to determine the extent to which interconnect equipment might interfere with efficient telephone service and efficient rates.

In the case of intercity and interstate telecommunication, I tend toward the view that the traditional service of telephone companies in transmitting voices could be regulated in the traditional way, namely the certificate of public convenience and necessity in the form of regulated monopoly.

In the case of interstate teletransmission of data, I am more inclined to believe that since this has not been a traditional activity of the telephone companies, other organizations, under sensible rules of operation, might well serve the general public along with the telephone company efficiently.

CONGRATULATIONS TO GOLD MEDAL WINNER HOWARD DAVIS JR.

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that one of the many young athletes to bring honor to self, community, and Nation by winning a gold medal in the recently completed Montreal Olympics was a constituent of mine, Howard Davis Jr. of Glen Cove, Long Island. This amazing 20-year-old boxer won the Olympic championship in the lightweight division despite a deep personal tragedy that would have overcome a less determined man.

Howard Davis, however, is no ordinary individual. Often compared to world heavyweight champion Muhammad Ali, Howard is an awesomely talented young boxer. He is tremendously versatile in the ring, having the ability to dance and jab his way to victory yet having the power necessary to knock out one opponent and score a technical knockout over another. Rollie Schwartz, U.S. boxing team manager, said of him:

He has the fastest hands of any amateur I've ever seen . . . He's a beautiful boxer.

For Howard, the gold medal victory over Simian Cutov of Romania was the climax of an extremely successful amateur career which included three Golden Glove titles and the world championship in the 125-pound division. We wish Howard the best of luck in the future and hope that he never again has to face the kind of tragedy that darkened his hour of triumph in Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, everybody on Long Island and, indeed, everybody in the country, must be very proud of this young champion. A credit to the Nation, Howard Davis Jr. stands as still another example of the tremendous drive for achievement that characterizes the United States of America.

FREE CHOICE OF HEALTH CARE IS BEST

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, our private, free-choice system of health care, which over the last 200 years has made our system the finest in the world, provides most Americans with high quality care at the lowest possible cost. In contrast with socialized health care systems in countries such as Great Britain and Sweden, our private system has fostered constant innovation and improvement without serious shortages of hospital beds, waiting lists, or emigration of skilled physicians.

However, our health care system is now approaching a crisis due to rising costs not, as some suggest, because of the lack of Government planning or intervention, but rather because of the sheer weight of Government programs, regulations, and the paperwork they entail. Instead of schemes such as comprehensive national health insurance, which would lead to a disastrous socialized system of health care, we need to relieve our private providers of the inhibitive controls imposed on them by the Congress and the Federal bureaucracy.

To alleviate many of the detrimental side effects of Federal intervention under which our health care system has suffered, I am introducing a bill today that will guarantee the right of all Americans to quality medical care by providing congressional oversight of proposed regulations, eliminating utilization review and PSRO procedures, and insuring patients who are not receiving Federal assistance for health care that their medical records will not be surveyed by the prying eyes of a Federal bureaucrat.

All too often Federal departments and agencies have adopted regulations contrary to the intent of Congress as set forth in the relevant legislation. The Congress only recourse, heretofore, has been to adopt legislation specifically repealing such regulations. This bill would provide a congressional review period of 90 legislative days before proposed Federal rules in the health care field would go into effect, giving us the opportunity to examine all their ramifications, both good and bad.

Regulations in the utilization review organizations in the medicare, medicaid and child health programs and the professional standard review organizations—PSRO—as presently constituted, invite malpractice suits and threaten the confidentiality of patient medical records. By establishing rigid "norms" for medical care, these regulations will discourage individualized and innovative treatment and the development of new medical techniques. Rather than saving money, they are likely to cost more in the long run as manpower is diverted from providing care to completing paperwork, to the detriment of doctors, patients, and the American taxpayer. These review organizations would be repealed under the provisions of this bill.

With a growing awareness of the right to privacy, the lack of protection of the confidentiality of patient medical records is also of great concern today. Some Government agencies now have the authority to inspect the records of all patients, not just those receiving Federal aid—a practice required by employees of PSRO in order to set up their standards or norms for medical care. This bill forbids, under penalty of law, the acquisition or inspection of records of those not receiving Federal medical assistance without the patient's express written authorization.

While the passage of this legislation is not the total answer to the problem of Government intervention in the health care field, it would resolve a number of problems. First of all, it would discourage malpractice suits due to perceived deviation from arbitrary "norms." Second, it would encourage innovation on the part of doctors in medical treatment and insure many patients that the nature of their treatment would be kept confidential. Third, it would promote the efficient utilization of manpower by lifting the paperwork burden. Fourth, it would maintain freedom of choice in the acquisition of medical care and finally, it would hold down the spiral in medical costs due to factors other than inflation.

For the benefit of my colleagues I include the text of my bill at the conclusion of my remarks:

H.R. 15043

Mr. Crane (for himself and Mr. Stephens, Mr. Kemp, Mr. Kindness, Mr. Brinkley, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Ketchum, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Davis, Mr. Rose, Mr. Paul, Mr. Conlan, Mr. Symms, Mr. Rousselot, Mr. Archer, Mr. Miller of Ohio, Mr. Collins of Texas, Mr. Robinson, and Mr. Mathis.)

A bill to guarantee the right of all Americans to quality medical care, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Comprehensive Right-to-Quality Medical Care Act of 1976".

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF PROPOSED HEALTH CARE REGULATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) Whenever any officer or agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government (including any independent establishment of the United States) proposes to prescribe any health care regulation, he shall submit such regulation to each House of Congress together with a report containing a full explanation thereof.

(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), a proposed health care regulation shall become effective 90 legislative days after the date of its submission to the Congress as provided in subsection (a), or at such later time as may be required by law or specified in such regulation.

(2) No proposed health care regulation shall become effective if, before the expiration of the period of 90 legislative days beginning on the date of submission to Congress of such regulation under subsection

(a), either House of Congress (in accordance with subsection (3)) adopts a resolution the substance of which disapproves such regulation because it contains provisions which are contrary to law or inconsistent with the intent of the Congress, or because it goes beyond the mandate of the legislation which it is designed to implement or in the administration of which it is designed to be used.

(3) Upon the adoption by Congress of a concurrent resolution during the period of 90 legislative days beginning on the date of submission to Congress of a proposed health care regulation under subsection (a), such regulation may become effective either immediately or as soon thereafter as is permitted by law, in accordance with such resolution.

(4) As used in this subsection:

(A) The term "legislative days" does not include any calendar day on which both Houses of Congress are not in session.

(B) The term "health care regulation" means any rule or regulation, or change thereof, to be used in the administration or implementation of any law of the United States pertaining to health care.

(c)(1) Any resolution introduced under subsection (b)(1) shall be referred to a committee by the Speaker of the House or by the President of the Senate, as the case may be.

(2) If and when the committee has reported the resolution, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. Such motion is highly privileged and is not debatable. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(3) No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

(4)(A) Motions to postpone, made with respect to the consideration of the resolution, and motions to proceed to the consideration of the resolution, and motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(B) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to the resolution shall be decided without debate.

(C) Except to the extent specifically otherwise provided in the proceeding provisions of this section, consideration of any resolution with respect to a proposed rule, regulation, or change in either House of Congress shall be governed by the Rules of that House which are applicable to other resolutions in similar circumstances.

(d) Subsection (c) is enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (as far as relating to the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(e) This section shall not apply with respect to a proposed health care regulation which (but for this section) becomes effective before the first day of the first month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

REPORTING OF CERTAIN REGULATIONS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 3. (a) At least 60 days before the initial publication by an agency or department of the Federal Government of any health cost regulation, the head of such department or agency shall submit notice of intended publication of such regulation and the text of such regulation to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(b) For the purpose of subsection (a), the term "health cost regulation" means every rule, instruction, or statement of policy (or interpretation thereof) of general application and future effect, including the amendment or repeal thereof, designed to implement or make specific any provision of Federal law relating to (1) costs or expenditures of, or reimbursements to, individuals or providers of health care, or (2) the fixing of any rate or charge, but does not include such regulations, instructions, or statements of policy or interpretations thereof concerning only the internal management of such department or agency and not affecting directly the rights of or procedures available to individuals or providers of health care.

REPEAL OF MEDICARE UTILIZATION REVIEW PROVISIONS

SEC. 4. (a) Section 1861(k) of the Social Security Act is repealed.

(b)(1) Section 1814(a) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "paragraphs (6) and (9)" in clause (2)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (9)";

(B) by striking out "paragraphs (6) and (9)" in clause (2)(D) and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (9)";

(C) by inserting "and" immediately after the semicolon at the end of clause (4);

(D) by striking out the semicolon at the end of clause (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(E) by striking out clauses (6) and (7).

(2) Clause (2) of section 1842(a) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "(2)(A)" and all that follows down through "(B) assist providers" and inserting in lieu thereof "(2) assist providers"; and

(B) by striking out ", and provide procedures" and all that follows through "to make reviews of utilization".

(3) Section 1861(e) of such Act is amended by striking out clause (6).

(4) Section 1861(j) of such Act is amended by striking out clause (8).

(5) Section 1861(r)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "(k),".

(6)(A) The first sentence of section 1865(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "; except—" and all that follows through "such Commission." and inserting in lieu thereof "; except any standard, promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (9) thereof, which is higher than the requirements prescribed for such accreditation by such Commission.".

(B) The second sentence of section 1865(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "If such Commission, as a condition for accreditation of a hospital, imposes a standard which the Secretary determines is at least equivalent to the standard promulgated by the Secretary as described in the matter following clause (2) of the preceding sentence, the Secretary is authorized to find that all institutions so accredited by such Commission also comply with the standard so promulgated.".

(7) Section 1866 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out subsection (d), and

(B) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d). Repeal of Utilization Review Provisions of Medicaid and

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH PROGRAMS

SEC. 5. (a) Section 1903(i) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "; or" at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(2) by striking out clause (4).

(b) Section 506(f) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "; or" at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(2) by striking out clause (4).

REPEAL OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS REVIEW PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Part B of title XI of the Social Security Act is repealed.

(b) Section 506(f) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS REVIEW" in the heading; and

(2) by striking out "Part A—General Provisions" immediately before section 1101.

GUARANTEE OF CONFIDENTIALITY OF MEDICAL RECORDS

SEC. 7. (a) No officer, employee, or agent of the United States, or any agency or department thereof, may inspect, acquire, or otherwise require for any reason whatever, any part of medical or dental records of patients whose medical or dental care was not, or will not be, paid by the Federal Government, or was not, or will not be, paid for (in whole or in part) under a Federal program or any other programs receiving Federal financial assistance, unless such patient has authorized such disclosure in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) A patient may authorize disclosure under subsection ( ) if he furnishes a signed and dated statement in which he—

(1) authorizes such disclosure for a specific period;

(2) identifies the patient records which are auhorized to be disclosed; and

(3) specifies the purposes for which, and the agencies to which, such records may be disclosed.

(c) Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

(d) In addition to any other remedy contained in this section or otherwise available, injunctive relief shall be available to any person aggrieved by a violation or threatened violations of this section.

(e) Should any other law of the United States grant, or appear to grant, power or authority to any person to violate subsection (a), the provisions thereof shall supersede and pro tanto override and annul such law, except those statutes hereinafter enacted which specifically refer to this section.

(f) The provisions of this section shall become effective upon the expiration of the period of 90 days immediately following the date of enactment of this Act.

COMMENDATION FOR ISRAEL

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have cosponsored a resolution commending the State of Israel for its brave and swift action against the terrorists that hijacked the Air France jetliner on June 27.

Our own Nation once would have dared to rescue its citizens from international thugs, but now our Government seems to have lost the will to resist aggression.

The action of Israel in rescuing the innocent victims of hijacking was and is a moral victory. The free world—or what

is euphemistically now called the free world—has had very few moral victories recently, and this one ought not to be soon forgotten. It certainly ought not to be misrepresented as aggression on the part of Israel nor a violation of the national sovereignty of Uganda. On the individual level, one has no right to commit crimes in the privacy of his own home, and then claim invasion of privacy when the government seeks to apprehend and punish the criminal. And on the national level, no nation has the right to commit crimes within its borders or to offer sanctuary to criminals, and then claim that its national sovereignty has been violated when efforts to stop the crimes and rescue the victims are made by other nations.

The action of Israel is both commendable and exemplary. The fact that Israel's action has been decried and Israel reviled is simply another indication of the moral enervation of the West.

DEPOLITICIZING HEALTH CARE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. RON PAUL and myself today are introducing a bill to repeal titles XV and XVI of the Public Health Service Act, which were created by Public Law 93–641, the "National Health Planning and Resources Development Act of 1974."

The consequences of Federal health planning will be disastrous and thus Public Law 93–641 should be repealed immediately, for the following reasons:

First, the law provides both the mechanism and the means for total, centralized control of health care by the Federal Government. Title XV establishes the mechanism by, first, directing the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue guidelines concerning national health planning policy; second, setting "national health priorities"; and third, creating a nationwide network of "health systems agencies," "health service areas," and "State health planning and development agencies."

Title XVI provides the means by authorizing Federal aid for developing "health resources"—essentially building new medical facilities or modernizing old ones—and Federal funding for the health systems agencies established in title XV. Acceptance of these funds brings a medical facility under Federal control, if indeed it is not already taking orders from HEW through prior acceptance of funds from Federal programs such as medicare, medicaid, Hill-Burton, et cetera.

Obviously, this is a major step toward complete nationalization of the health care professions, as was made clear by its proponents:

> The important concept embodied in this legislation, that health financing should be closely related to health planning, has subsequently been reflected in almost all major proposals for national health insurance through a series of devices intended to assure that national health insurance does not pay for costly services which the planning process determines are unneeded. (House Report 93–1382, to accompany H.R. 16804, p. 8.)

Aside from the intentions of its sponsors, however, Federal health planning by its very nature will lead to total Federal control of health care. One of the law's alleged purposes is to control the cost of health care, which has been rising at a rate higher than that of inflation for the past several years. But it attempts to do this by treating the effect, the rising prices, not the cause, which is the Government programs that socialize health care. When payments of medical services are collectivized, as under medicare and medicaid, the individual pays the same amount regardless of the cost and frequency of his own treatments. If health care is "free" on demand, demand soars and prices rise.

The health planners propose to stop this by ordering prices to hold still. They propose maximum allowable cost for drugs, and professional standards review for the elderly and indigent under medicare and medicaid, to make sure the Government pays for no unnecessary services. The Professional Standards Review Organizations, already established by another law, have the authority to control doctors' fees, to review confidential medical records in order to standardize allowable medical services, and to review hospital admissions.

Thus free medicine for the elderly and indigent is leading directly to Government rationing of health care services to these citizens. And now the health planners are talking about a series of devices to insure that the Government does not pay for costly services which the planning process determines are unneeded, thereby extending Government rationing of health care to everyone.

Such controls, however, will not work unless they are total. Prices will continue to rise so long as the Government continues its involvement in health care, leading the planners to lobby for complete nationalization. There are only two ways to deal with the consequences of the insatiable demand induced by Government health care programs. One is to eliminate the Government programs and allow the market to bring supply and demand back into balance. The other is to give the Government total control over supply.

The health planners leave no doubt which option they choose, and are already claiming Public Law 93–641 to be inadequate. For example, Dr. Charles C. Edwards, former commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration and former assistant secretary for health at HEW, renewed his call for a National Health Authority to regulate medicine as a public utility in a keynote address before a meeting of the American Association for Comprehensive Health Planning last month, American Medical News, July 26, 1976. Dr. Edwards said:

> I am suggesting that health planning be merged with health cost regulation. Because without such a merger—without effective cost-containment—health planning, even under the best of circumstances, will remain an exercise in frustration and a bitter disappointment.

Dr. Edwards continued by endorsing regional rate-setting agencies operating under Federal guidelines.

In other words, health planning will not work unless the Government has total control over the supply of health services, without which those who wish to determine how much, if any, health care each individual American citizen will be allowed, will be frustrated and disappointed.

Second, Federal health planning is politicizing the entire field of health care. Instead of market demand determining and directing the supply of medical facilities and services, these decisions increasingly are being made by Government and quasi-government officials. The decision to build a new hospital is not being determined by the demand for medical services by the people in a given area, but by officials of a health systems agency who, in conjunction with officials of the State health planning and development agency and officials of HEW's appropriate regional planning center, attempt to determine if their health plans are in accord with the national health priorities set by Congress and the national guidelines for health planning issued by the Secretary of HEW. Thus decisions affecting the health of millions of people must go through layer after layer of health planners before anything can be done. And since the decision is political, not economic, those with political pull will get the new hospital, if anyone does, not necessarily those who need it most.

Such a system is designed not to provide health services, but to prevent them from being provided.

Third, this law undoubtedly will distort and disrupt the delivery of health services to rural and nonrural areas. Not only do such areas lack the political pull to compete with the more densely populated urban areas, but the national health priorities established by Congress discriminate against less populated regions. These priorities, as mandated by section 1502 of title XV, include:

> (1) The provision of primary care services for medically underserved populations, especially those which are located in rural or economically depressed areas.
>
> (2) The development of multi-institutional systems for coordination or consolidation of institutional health services (including obstetric, pediatric, emergency medical, intensive and coronary care, and radiation therapy services).
>
> (3) The development by health service institutions of the capacity to provide various levels of care (including intensive care, acute general care, and extended care) on a geographically integrated basis.

Apparently, primary care services are to be provided in rural areas, but other levels of care only on a geographically integrated basis. What about a rural hospital which provides intensive care? Must its patients be transferred to urban hospitals? Or what about a rural hospital which wants to add facilities for intensive care? Must it wait until the population in its vicinity reaches some figure arbitrarily determined by a bureaucrat in a regional health planning agency?

Fourth, Public Law 93–641 is uncon-

stitutional, probably on many grounds. At the very least it is a violation of the 10th amendment. In fact, the State of North Carolina has already filed suit charging that the law is an illegal intrusion on the State's rights.

If we continue down the road being paved by Federal health planners, the American people will be denied the right to control their own health. Government planners not only will be setting doctor and hospital fees, but rationing medical care as well. Whether or not someone should have an operation no longer will be a medical decision arrived at by the individual and his doctor, but a political decision derived at by government health planners. In Great Britain, where health planners have been in control for many years under the National Health Service, patients are waiting in line for up to a year for a hospital bed to have a needed operation.

This is what Government health planning will lead to in our country if we do not change our course and begin systematically eliminating Government control of health care.

Repealing Public Law 93-641 would be an excellent first step toward depoliticizing the field of medicine.

GENERIC DRUG LABELING

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court recently handed down a landmark decision declaring States may not prohibit prescription drug price advertising. This has been a goal of mine for several years and the object of legislation introduced in the past several congresses, including the present H.R. 996, which is cosponsored by 45 of our colleagues.

I applaud the Supreme Court's action that, for the first time, extends first amendment protection to advertising. It is also a victory for the free enterprise system, for it opens the door to price competition in this area for the first time.

This was the subject of a comprehensive consumer study I released 3 years ago entitled "Rx: Retail Drug Price Competition." I wish to speak today about two other issues raised by that study and the subject of companion legislation. They are the Prescription Drug Labeling Act and the Prescription Drug Freshness Act.

H.R. 998, the Prescription Drug Labeling Act, would require the use of a drug's established or generic name whenever its brand-name appears. It would also permit pharmacists, regardless of State or local laws, to substitute the lowest-cost equivalent drug for the one prescribed, unless the physician states otherwise. This would effectively repeal anti-substitution laws in about 35 States. To prevent possible abuses, the bill would require pharmacists to dispense the lowest-price equivalent drug available.

Before discussing this subject in greater detail, I would first like to turn briefly to H.R. 1001, the Prescription Drug Freshness Act.

Since this bill was introduced, I am pleased to report the Food and Drug Administration has made some progress in implementing its goals.

My bill would require all drugs whose effectiveness or potency, as determined by FDA, becomes diminished after storage to note on the label the date beyond which they should not be used. Present regulations require that only those drugs with stability problems show expiration dates.

Fortunately, the agency has at last proposed regulations which would accomplish much of what my bill proposes. But these proposals do not diminish the need for congressional action. Too often FDA regulations get watered down between the proposed-rule stage and promulgation—if they are ever promulgated at all. Moreover, regulations, unlike laws, are too easily changed.

Much of the opposition to open dating comes from those who fear a loss of repeat sales. The most common argument of opponents is that open dating will lead to self-diagnosis and self-prescribing. No one has ever presented any reliable evidence to support this questionable hypothesis. A person inclined to use a left-over drug for a recurrent or new illness would probably not be at all influenced by the presence of an expiration date.

Open dating—which is available from all manufacturers to all pharmacists—makes good health sense as well as good economic sense. It protects the consumer from being sold out-of-date medicine, it encourages the pharmacist to keep a closer eye on and circulate his inventory, and it discourages consumers from keeping old, ineffective and possibly dangerous drugs in their homes. Of course, if a physician were to prescribe a drug already on hand and not out of date, there would be no need to pay for a second precription.

Generic prescribing by physicians can save American consumers hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Sponsors of the recently enacted Florida law permitting generic substitution estimate that patients in their State will save $40 million a year as a result; even opponents of substitution concede some $5 million in annual savings.

A recent study by two pharmacology Ph. D.'s, published in the American Journal of Public Health, concluded:

> Prescriptions written and dispensed generically are cheaper to the patient than those written and dispensed for brand-name products of the same drug.

The investigators noted that pharmacist frequently dispense brand-name drugs on generically written prescriptions in order to maximize profits. They foresaw a decline in consumer drug costs as generic prescribing expands. Of course, cost is also a function of services offered by the pharmacist, but the APHA article concluded that it is far less significant than the cost of the drug itself.

Repeal of anti-substitution laws will permit pharmacists to exercise their professional judgment in dispensing the lowest priced equivalent drug. Pharmacists already have the right to dispense any equivalent drug they choose if the prescription is written generically, that is, does not specify any brand-name. My bill would make two significant changes in the present system: First, it would permit substitutions regardless of whether the prescription uses a brand-name, unless the prescribing physician specifically states otherwise, and second, only the lowest price equivalent drug available could be substituted.

The use of generic in addition to brand names will facilitate consumer price comparisons. By introducing an element of consistency, generic labeling also will make drug-price posting and advertising, now permitted under a recent Supreme Court decision, more meaningful. Competition, a crucial element in our economy but one too long absent from retail prescription pharmacy, will be enhanced as consumers become able to shop for the best buy.

Repeated surveys by government agencies at all levels, by public-interest organizations, by academicians and others, and by my own office, have consistently demonstrated that a wide disparity exists between prices of generic and brand-name drugs.

Opponents of generic dispensing—primarily the brand name manufacturers whose philosophy is "big makes best"—argue that distinct manufacturing processes may produce therapeutic differences in equivalent drugs made by different companies.

The assertion that repeal of antisubstitution laws will result in a deluge of inferior, foreign-make drugs into the U.S. market is typical of the hysterical, misleading and inaccurate scare tactics employed by opponents. Obviously, the high U.S. standards will remain in effect. In fact, the FDA has reported that there is no evidence that brand name drugs are more effective or safer than nonbrand. And it is unfair of manufacturers to imply that pharmacists are not professional or responsible enough to dispense only those drugs in which they have faith.

In fact, some of the big brand name products may actually have been produced by one of the small drug firms. It is not unusual for big and small drug companies alike to buy bulk from the same manufacturer and package the product under their own names, some generic and some trademarked.

Even the American Pharmaceutical Association admits it is unlikely that a drug "meeting established standards under Federal drug laws will not perform clinically as expected," according to the testimony of its executive director, William Apple, before the Senate Finance Committee.

The National Academy of Sciences' Drug Research Board last year unanimously called for repeal of antisubstitution laws. It concluded that "in the absence of data to the contrary, there is no inherent reason for choosing the more expensive drug product simply because of the familiarity of the physician or pharmacist with a brand name."

This was a reversal of a previous position and was prompted, the Board re-

ported, by the realization that repeal of antisubstitution laws would not prohibit a doctor from specifying a particular brand name drug for his patient. Another factor influencing the decision was the positive result of repeal in Florida and Michigan.

According to the Congressional Research Service, 15 States now permit drug substitution, the most recent being Colorado, Delaware, Virginia, and Wisconsin. The Connecticut and Iowa Legislatures have approved substitution, and South Carolina is expected to follow suit. Those States which already permit substitution are Arkansas, California, Florida, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, and Oregon.

The Federal Government's third-party reimbursement programs also stress generic prescribing. HEW's MAC—maximum allowable cost—program, which is scheduled to go into effect next month, sets a reimbursement limit on equivalent-drug products by different manufacturers at the price of the lowest cost generic version available. FDA is developing a list of interchangeable drugs to be used in this program, which covers medicare, medicaid and other HEW-administered health care efforts.

Resistance to drug substitution comes not only from brand name manufacturers who stand to lose money as a result of increased competition, but also from many doctors. Their concern is more a matter of professional pride than of economics, although their professional organizations have pocketbook motivation.

I want to stress that this bill would in no way permit a pharmacist or anyone else to overrule a physician's decision. The basic daignosis and the judgment for treatment remain with the physician, as they must. If he wishes a particular drug to be dispensed, his decision must and will be followed. All he needs to do is mark the prescription "no substitution" or "dispense this brand only."

Where bioequivalence problems exist, both the doctor and the pharmacist should be aware of them. The doctor always has the option to bar substitution and the pharmacist should dispense only equivalent drugs. Only 20 to 25 drug entities on the market today, however, have, according to FDA, had "documented bioequivalence problems" and therefore may not be interchangeable.

But in lieu of physician prohibitions, the pharmacist—a trained professional and a member of the health care team—will be free to exercise his best judgment and to dispense a lower price equivalent drug.

This practice will assist the harried physician who does not always have the time or the opportunity to keep fully informed of all drug names and prices. They often have difficulty assessing the quality of available drugs because experience with a given substance is frequently limited. Too often, they are aware only of the manufacturer—perhaps for reasons entirely unrelated to the quality of the drug.

Doctors are the principal target of the nearly $1 billion spent by the drug industry annually on advertising and promotion of their products—this, incidentally, is 50 percent more than they spend on research and quality control. This billion-dollar expenditure has nothing to do with the patient's health, but is used to beguile him and his doctor and to combat his attempts to get a better drug buy. It tends to monopolize doctor's sources of information and keep many from adopting critical and scientific attitudes toward drugs.

This influence on doctors begins early—in fact, even before they become doctors. It starts with gifts while they are students—a black bag, a stethoscope, some textbooks. It continues with visits from salesmen, invitations to industry-financed conferences, gifts, and a massive effort at postgraduate indoctrination by those who profit from brand-name prescribing, overprescribing and misprescribing.

The doctor's primary source of information about available drugs is the Physicians Desk Reference—PDR—a catalog which illustrates prescription drugs and explains their usage. It is filled with advertising by major drug manufacturers, distributed free of charge to most doctors, and is found in every hospital. Contrary to its implied universality, PDR is incomplete—it mentions only a few generic names for widely consumed, basic drugs. The widespread use of this volume actually serves to conceal from doctors the existence of other manufacturers who can often supply the same drugs at lower cost. The higher price of these drugs is passed on to the patient, who is caught unaware in this web of economic gain. Only in the United States is this type of compendium produced by private industry, most other nations, recognizing the importance of such a listing and its need for universality—publish it themselves.

The American Medical Association and other influential health organizations are largely dependent on the drug industry for financial support. Lucrative advertising sales to the drug makers support their medical publications, raising the possibility of a conflict of interest. The Washington Post recently reported that the AMA Journal avoids reporting unfavorable findings on some drugs for fear of losing advertising. I am pleased to note that the FDA is finally investigating this problem.

Unfortunately, doctors are often poorly informed about drug prices. Too many seem concerned solely with their patient's physical health and ignore their economic health. Perhaps it is because someone making over $100,000 a year cannot empathize with the problems of someone earning less than $10,000.

Since the physician does not pay for the drugs he prescribes, he is usually unaware of and unconcerned about their cost. This insensitivity, combined with the doctor's lack of information about the multiple sources of equivalent drugs, contributes to the high inflation in health care costs, and especially to the high cost of drugs.

In the overall system, the consumer has little power. As Senator Estes Kefauver observed several years ago:

He who orders does not buy and he who buys does not order.

This situation is, I believe, unique to prescription medicine.

Generic substitution can help remedy the problem. Although doctors will still retain sole discretion to "order," the consumer, with the help of his neighborhood pharmacist, can have more to say about the price he pays.

Substitution is already a common practice. It is not unusual for a pharmacist, unable to fill a prescription, to call a physician and either ask for a substitution or request that he be allowed to use a drug already on hand. Of course, if the original prescription was written generically, the pharmacist is free to dispense any equivalent drug available. Although this offers the consumer an opportunity to save money, surveys have shown it also offers a potential for abuse. Some pharmacists apparently view substitution, as presently practiced, as an opportunity to unload some high-priced, slow-moving inventory. This legislation, as I have noted, would specifically prohibit price-gouging by requiring the pharmacist to dispense the lowest-priced equivalent drug.

Substitution would benefit pharmacists economically as well as professionally. It would permit them to carry smaller inventories without fear of losing sales, thus reducing overhead and acquisition costs. Hopefully, pharmacists would share these savings with the consumer.

The drug industry will not change overnight if we permit substitution. Most drugs on the market today still are single-source and patent-protected. But the number of multiple-source drugs is increasing, and even the name-brand manufacturers are marketing some so-called "generic lines" to capitalize on growing public awareness. According to one recent report, there are approximately 700 basic drug formulations sold under 20,000 different brand names.

Nevertheless, significant improvements would result from the proposal. The first group to benefit would be the elderly. Although senior citizens comprise only about 10 percent of the population, they account for 25 percent of drug purchases—over $1.25 billion. They spend three times the per capita amount on medicine of those under 65.

These bills—H.R. 998 and H.R. 1001—if adopted, would mark a major advance in combating inflationary health costs, while contributing to the health and safety of consumers.

Lower prices through increased competition will inevitably benefit the American people. They pose a threat only to the bloated profits of a number of large corporations which claim that pharmacists cannot make the basic decisions for which they have been trained.

Open dating will protect the health of patients and help make certain consumers are sold safe and effective drugs.

Neither of these bills will cost the American taxpayer a single cent—in fact, they will contribute to significant savings for millions of Americans.

PROHIBIT UNIONIZATION OF THE MILITARY

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will prohibit members of the Armed Forces from joining a labor organization. As the power of labor unions in this country continues to grow, and organizing of public employees into unions becomes more widespread, it is essential that safeguards be enacted which will protect the viability and effectiveness of our Armed Forces and the security of our Nation against the politicalization of the military.

In the private sector, unions have provided a means for workers to voice their grievances, demand higher wages and better working conditions, but there can be no argument as to the ill effects that the tools of unionism—strikes and collective bargaining—would have on the defense capability of our Nation.

In a recent statement on this subject, Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, made the following observations:

AFGE (The American Federation of Government Employees Union) is carefully laying plans to organize the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps. The long term implications of the union plan are horrifying . . . In this time of international tension, could America entrust its safety to armed forces directed more by union bosses than by generals? I hope we never have to find out.

The incredible, but all-too-likely ramifications of a unionized military are many: Unions refusing to let soldiers make all-night marches because conditions are too harsh. Marines and Army recruits out of shape simply because their "shop steward" insists that the physical training is too strenuous. Jet fighters and bombers grounded until new contracts are negotiated by union bosses. The list could go on and on.

The justification for unions is that they provide a balance to management, and a check against possible exploitation of workers in the name of profit. Yet, the military is not operated for profit. The military has made great strides in improving the important civil rights of its workers. Its sole mission is the defense of the country—something which cannot be jeopardized by an arbitrary union strike or work stoppage.

The legislation I am introducing today will prevent members of the Armed Forces from joining a labor organization. Solicitation of Armed Forces personnel by labor unions will also be protested. The sanctions of this law would not apply, however, where the labor union in question has purposes which are unrelated to the individual's membership in the Armed Forces.

Let me encourage my colleagues to review this bill which follows:

H.R. 15061

A bill To amend chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit union organization in the armed forces, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 975. Union organizing and membership prohibited

"(a) As used in this section—

"(1) 'Member of the armed forces,' means a member of the armed forces who is (A) serving on active duty, (B) a member of a Reserve component, or (C) in a retired status.

"(2) 'Labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee (including any member of the armed forces) representation committee or plan, in which employees (including members of the armed forces) participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievance, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

"(3) 'Employer' includes the United States Government.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any individual, group, association, organization, or other entity to enroll any member of the armed forces in, or to solicit or otherwise encourage any member of the armed forces to join, any labor organization.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any member of the armed forces to join or to solicit or otherwise encourage any other members of the armed forces to join any labor organization.

"(d) The provisions of subsections (b) and (c) shall not apply in any case in which any individual, group, association, organization, or other entity enrolls any member of the armed forces in, or solicits or otherwise encourages any member of the armed forces to join, any labor organization, or in any case in which a member of the armed forces joins a labor organization or solicits or otherwise encourages another member of the armed forces to join a labor organization if the activity, purpose, or function of the labor organization with which the member is concerned is unrelated to his membership in the armed forces.

"(e)(1) Any individual violating subsection (b) or (c) shall be punished by imprisonment of not more than five years.

"(2) Any labor organization guilty of violating subsection (b) shall be punished by a fine of not less than $25,000 or more than $50,000.".

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"975. Union organizing and membership prohibited.".

HONORING OLYMPIC CHAMPION MICHAEL PLUMB

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate one of my consistituents, Michael Plumb of Oyster Bay Cove, Long Island, for his tremendous success in the equestrian events of the recently completed Montreal Olympics. Michael, an Olympic veteran, won his fourth silver medal in the individual competition, finishing behind teammate Tad Coffin of Brookville, Long Island. He was also an integral part of the American team that brought the team gold medal to the United States for the first time since 1948.

Michael's success is truly admirable in view of the extreme difficulty of the grueling equestrian event. After the dressage, the first phase of the 3-day event, each rider must face the dangerous cross-country phase which was made especially treacherous by an early morning downpour. Of the 28 riders that began this phase of the equestrian competition, only 14 crossed the finish line. Michael was one of those 14, finishing only seconds behind Tad, the winner of that phase.

Both Michael Plumb and Tad Coffin are a part of Long Island's continuing tradition of excellence in equestrianism. Indeed, Michael has followed in the illustrious footsteps of his father, Charlie Plumb, who was a national 3-day event champion.

We are all proud of Michael Plumb. His triumph has brought honor to him, to Oyster Bay Cove, and to the entire Nation.

AMERICAN BUSINESS FIGHTS BACK

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, American business is under serious attack from many quarters.

We often forget that our system of free enterprise has made us the most prosperous nation in the world, with wealth more widely distributed than in any other place.

The reason free enterprise is vital to our society, however, is not primarily economic. It is, instead, social and political. Capitalism is, we must never forget, only freedom and democracy applied to the marketplace. If it is destroyed there, it will inevitably die in other sectors of our society as well.

One of the attacks upon business at the present time takes the form of urging "divestiture" of the oil companies. This means, quite simply, that each oil company would be permitted only a single function. The end result would not be to stimulate competition, but to restrict it. The effect would not be to lower prices to consumers, but to raise them.

In this regard, Prof. Neil H. Jacoby of the graduate school of management at the University of California at Los Angeles states that, "Forced vertical disintegration of large U.S. oil companies would lead to higher priced petroleum products, would increase dependence upon foreign energy, would strengthen and prolong the effectiveness of the OPEC cartel, and paradoxically, would probably make for a less competitive structure of the industry."

Finally, U.S. business is beginning to fight back—and to respond to the false allegations of its critics. It is high time that this was done. Frank Ikard, president of the American Petroleum Institute, for example, declares that, "If a punitive course is adopted against the oil companies that are owned by 14 million of our citizens—if monkey wrenches are thrown into the works by capricious administrative decisions—it would be tantamount to taking away the private property of these people just as surely as if their houses were stolen."

In its radio commentary for July 11, 1976, America's Future, a nonprofit foundation supporting the free enterprise system, presents an important discussion of the current attack upon American business—and its response.

This commentary concludes that, "It is clear that oil is far too precious a commodity for the socialist-minded utopians to tinker with. By 1980, our need for oil will double. It is the source of such vital products as plastics, synthetic fabrics, heating fuel, fertilizers. And today, every day, U.S. motorists purchase 277 million gallons of gasoline—more than a gallon a day for each man, woman, and child in the Nation. Without oil, whole economies and societies would collapse overnight—possibly ours as well, at least until and unless alternative sources of energy can be developed free of foreign control and safe from seizure at the well or on the high seas."

I wish to share with my colleagues the commentary of America's Future as it was heard on the Mutual Radio Network on July 11, 1976, and insert the text of that commentary into the RECORD at this time:

BATTLE OVER BUSINESS

It is ironic! Just as the economy shows signs of recovering from the recession, critics of the American business establishment threaten to toss more monkey wrenches into the works.

The oil companies are too big, they argue. So let's break 'em up! Rising costs drive up steel prices. So the enemies of "big steel" demand quick government action to force a roll-back. There are loud cheers from the far left when anti-trust suits are brought against the telephone industry, or the foremost computer firm, or against other large and successful corporations.

The assault on business is nothing new. It dates back to the "trust-busters" of the early 1900's and to the New Deal "tinkerers" of the 1930's. It finds expression today in self-styled economic "revolutionaries" who would wipe out the free enterprise system, do away with private ownership and replace them with a Marxist society.

And how the extremists rush to exploit the headlined misdeeds, real or imagined, of a few corporations and executives! Their propaganda pitch would have the American people believe that all major companies and their officials are guilty of graft, corruption and other such crimes.

No one claims the business community is without fault. There are unethical practitioners in every segment of society. But few elements of American life are so zealously supervised, regulated and taxed by the government as are the corporations, companies, and other commercial and industrial entrepreneurs. Through the years, a vast bureaucratic machinery has emerged whose sole function is to control business. And sniping away from the sidelines are private "action groups" who believe "big is bad" and profits are "obscene."

Despite such obstacles, the American business community as a whole has continued to provide American consumers with the best, least expensive and most plentiful supplies of products and services of any nation in the world. Compare the lavish shopping centers and supermarkets of America with the endless lines of hungry consumers in communist countries waiting for the meager rations doled out by the state.

Or consider the example of Great Britain whose labor government is appealing to private enterprise to rescue the British economy from the crisis brought on by 30 years of socialist mismanagement and excesses. Certainly no thoughtful American would knowingly exchange our free, competitive economy based on private incentive for a state-run regime of planned austerity and perennial shortages. What the American people need are the facts. What the U.S. economy does not need is another heavy dose of bureaucratic patent medicine!

BUSINESS FIGHTS BACK

It seems strange that amid all the talk of an energy crisis there should arise new demands to break up the dozen-and-a-half largest oil companies.

The critics of "big oil" contend that by dismembering the companies prices somehow will go down and supplies will increase. By forcing the companies to "divest" themselves of all but one primary functions, it is argued, competition will thrive. Thus, an oil company which now researches for and produces oil and natural gas, makes and transports petroleum products and then retails them around the country would be allowed to engage in only one of these operations.

Supporters of "divestitute," as the scheme is called, overlook some basic facts. As economic experts have testified, dismantling the large, long-established oil companies would create confusion and chaos throughout the industry. Aside from causing internal disruption, the complex process of buying crude oil from the producing countries, now grouped together in a powerful cartel known as OPEC, would be thrown into disarray. Obviously a few strong, established companies can deal more effectively with OPEC than could dozens of smaller, newer ones.

According to Professor Neil H. Jacoby, of the Graduate School of Management of the University of California, Los Angeles, "such radical surgery on the corpus of the U.S. economy, whose petroleum industry produces around 7% of the nation's GNP—gross national product—would have incalculable consequences." Warns this instructor in business economics and policy: "Forced vertical disintegration of large U.S. oil companies would lead to higher-priced petroleum products, would increase dependence upon foreign energy, would strengthen and prolong the effectiveness of the OPEC cartel, and paradoxically, would probably make for a less competitive structure of the industry.

The U.S. Treasury Department, with uncharacteristic bluntness, warns that "destroying corporate organizations for the sake of 'smallness' can be terribly expensive to our society. It will be expensive in terms of less efficient energy production and will result in unnecessarily high capital costs for all firms, and ultimately higher costs to the consumers. This is a very expensive price for our economy to pay. . . ."

As for complaints alleging the oil industry is monopolistic, the facts show the contrary to be true. In addition to 20 companies generally classified as "majors," the industry consists of 131 companies operating 261 refineries in the U.S., more than 15,000 wholesalers and more than 300,000 gasoline retailers. The oil business actually is one of the most competitive industries in the country.

There are other important arguments against breaking up the oil companies. Only because of their efficiency and strength can the integrated oil companies generate and attract the enormous capital funds needed in oil operations. To operate a drilling rig in the North Sea, for example can cost as much as $50,000 a day. One major company, Texaco, alone spends more than one-and-a-quarter billion dollars a year on exploration and producing operations in 45 countries around the world.

The U.S. petroleum industry is the envy of all nations. American petroleum engineers and scientists, using American technology, have developed most of the world's major oil fields. These include the immensely productive fields of the Middle East and South America as well as newly developed deposits in Alaska and in the North Sea—the latter promising soon to make Great Britain and Norway self-sufficient in energy. The U.S. petroleum industry also has developed the skills and experience needed to transport oil over some of the most hostile terrain on earth, and to refine it under the most stringent environmental regulations yet known. And all of this is done at costs lower than in any other major country. Indeed, despite claims to the contrary, oil company profits rate lower than the average of U.S. industry as a whole.

FACTS AND FIGURES

There is yet another argument in favor of preserving the present structure of the oil industry. The six largest companies are 90% owned, directly or indirectly, by 14 million Americans. Many shares are also held by 91 colleges and universities, by 200 mutual insurance companies, and by some 1,000 charitable and educational foundations. Clearly if the integrated oil companies were to be broken up, the investments of all 14 million American shareholders and of the many institutional stockowners would be jeopardized.

Among the U.S. business leaders who believe it's time to fight back with the facts is Frank N. Ikard, President of the American Petroleum Institute. Says Ikard: "If a punitive course is adopted against the oil companies that are owned by 14 million of our citizens . . . if monkey wrenches are thrown into the works by capricious administrative decisions . . . it would be tantamount to taking away the private property of these people just as surely as if their houses were stolen."

It is clear that oil is far too precious a commodity for the socialist-minded utopians to tinker with. By 1980, our need for oil will double. It is the source of such vital products as plastics, synthetic fabrics, heating fuel, fertilizers. And today, every day, U.S. motorists purchase 277 million gallons of gasoline—more than a gallon a day for each man, woman and child in the nation. Without oil, whole economics and societies would collapse overnight—possibly ours as well, at least until and unless alternative sources of energy can be developed free of foreign control and safe from seizure at the well or on the high seas.

(NOTE.—Foregoing items covered in AF's Mutual Network Broadcast, July 11, 1976.)

NOT PRESENT TO VOTE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, due to responsibilities in my district I was not present to vote on certain matters coming before this body on Friday, July 30, 1976. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall 576: An amendment to H.R.

8401, Nuclear Fuel Assurance Act of 1976, striking those sections of the bill providing for Government-private industry uranium enrichment contracts, yea.

Rollcall 577: Adoption of House Resolution 1267, the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2525, Indian Health Care Improvement Act, yea.

Rollcall 578: Final passage of H.R. 2525, yea.

ONCE YOU GIVE UP LIVING YOU'RE THROUGH; THERE'S NOTHING LEFT

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, normally we preface material inserted in the RECORD with an introductory statement. On rare occasions the material speaks for itself so eloquently that our comments would be superfluous. At this point in the RECORD it is my privilege to call attention to an article appearing in the Daily News of Whittier, Calif. on July 28.

The article follows:

ONCE YOU GIVE UP LIVING YOU'RE THROUGH; THERE'S NOTHING LEFT

(By Richard Singer)

His need to reach out and touch someone is great. From his deprivation, from his isolation, he reaches out to the world.

And yet he does so anonymously.

"I'd rather you didn't use my name," he said "or tell people where I am. My name isn't important, really. They don't need to know who I am."

He's right, probably. His name isn't important.

His story is.

He tells it in his own words, lying on his stomach in his specially-built bed—a bed he hasn't left in 11 years.

He tells a story of a world without movement. Except for one finger on his right hand, he is paralyzed.

He tells a story of a world without sight. He is also blind.

He tells of a world of few people with whom to communicate; a world with human contacts that become fewer and fewer as the years go by.

And he tells it very well.

"I am a male with a 33-year history of rheumatoid spondylitis. The condition had deformed me over the years to such an extent that spinal surgery was required in order to enable me to be in a straight supine position and a prone position.

"While I am on my back I am completely helpless, even to the point of being unable to scratch my nose or an itch. In the prone position I am a bit more functional in that with the use of one finger I can turn my transistor radio on and off, operate a special telephone using a toggle switch, and drink my food through a straw.

"I am relating these thoughts in order that in some way I may touch another person who may face a difficult situation in which they find life unbearable or not worth living. If I can accomplish this to some degree, then I too, have fulfilled a goal in my life."

He has dictated his thoughts at the urging of Ira Lee Zummerman, a Whittier psychologist, who, at his request, recently administered to him a battery of intelligence and personality tests, "in order to determine my intelligence level and any personality changes which have occurred," as the result of his 11-year isolation. She found no mental deterioration and little personality change.

"He revealed well above average ability and normal personality structure," she reported.

"I was reared in a home in which my mother was a very religious and God-loving woman. My father's religious views were never clearly defined, although he did go to church on occasion. I was baptized and confirmed a Methodist.

"The religious foundation which I had acquired in my early years of church attendance possibly gave me the foundation to enable me to reach the goal I've reached today. I was never a complete believer in that I could not accept a blind belief in a religious philosophy without question. This in a sense made me more realistic of my acceptance of life's problems and the daily course of living.

"I was afflicted with the arthritic condition at the very early age of 20. It's progression forced me to consult medical help. The medical help for arthritis years ago was taking pills in order to relieve the pain and control the condition, which didn't work for me. Together with the pills and the desperation of having to maintain a living standard, I drifted back to my religious background seeking help through spiritual means.

"In attending church, I never seemed to feel the uplifting spiritual strength that I was seeking in order to cope with the physical destruction.

"Once placed in this bed I began to have many reflections regarding religion, especially regarding the healing aspects of religion. Despite the adverse condition I fould myself in, I still couldn't find the spiritual strength I needed through organized religion. I spoke to many ministers regarding my feelings and each time seemed to be left with an unfilled feeling, a sort of emptiness. There came a time, one Sunday afternoon, after a year on this bed, in which I felt that I had reached the end of the rope.

"I had a talk with myself and God. I expressed my feelings, asking that I either not wake up to see another day or, if I should, that I wake up sane, and not as a babbling idiot.

"Upon awakening the following morning . . . there was no great spiritual awakening, nor did I feel any strong religious conviction. The mental phenomenon seemed to awaken me to a realization of the adjustments that would be necessary for me to carry on.

"From then on life—mentally and physically—became more tolerable for me to cope with."

Despite his pain, despite his isolation, he has apparently not lost his sense of humor. He can laugh at himself a little, and in that humor, find awareness, find understanding—find some peace.

* * * * *

"There is an incident that I would like to relate which was humorous to an extent and yet made me realize how much we base many of our difficult situations on false hopes. A student nurse who was taking a two-week training course in this rehabilitation section was assigned to me.

"She asked if I thought I would walk again, and of course I answered, 'yes'.

" 'How do you intend to do that?' she asked. My response was that I would be turned to an upright position on the bed, and with the help of an aide, step off the platform, which was about eight inches from the floor. This of course was unreal since I couldn't bend my knees. She then asked, 'once you get on the floor what do you intend to do'?

"Then I will probably walk as far as the kitchen. Then she asked, 'What do you intend to do when you get to the kitchen?' My answer was that I would sit on a special chair, since my hips could only be moved about 20 degrees.

" 'Then what would you do?'

"I would get up and walk to the back of the house.

" 'And then what?'

"And I responded that by this time I would be tired enough to have to get back on the bed which would have required someone lifting me back up on the platform and rotating the bed backward to the level position.

"The way she questioned me, in her kind and sweet manner, made me realize how hopeless and unreal the situation really was. By human nature, I believe, we all tend to cling to that glimmer of hope and disregard the truth.

"The doctor, on making his routine rounds one morning, made me aware of the fact that no more could be done and that I had a brain, which I had better start using, because that was all I really had left. His statement came as a shock, but to some degree, having seen the physical destruction which had taken place and having adjusted to the changes, I believe I was fully aware that this was coming.

"Each of us, at some time in our lives, must face what is real and adjust our lives accordingly.

"I offer no answers to what has sustained me for I don't believe there are any pat answers to anything in life. We gain our strength from many sources. Possibly through deep religious convictions or possibly through an inner strength which we are unaware of.

"In contemplating my life over the many years in which I have had the time to think, I have found that I was never able to gain much from any outside source. It is like walking down a rocky road in which we keep stumbling and each time having to pick ourselves up and keep going.

"Nobody can make a pattern for you and say, "This is your life; follow these paths and you will have no problems.' You can be sure of one thing. You aren't going to die by praying for it to happen when everything else seems lost.

"We open our eyes each morning to face a new day. What we do with this day is up to us. We can make it a fruitful day, in which we find comfort and interest in others, or we may lie in a bed full of self pity. Each of us must look within ourselves in order to find out who, and what, we are.

"There is nobody who is going to take your hand and lead the way. We must each face our own problems and solve them to the best of our own ability."

He tells of his life in the convalescent hospital—of his life of near isolation. He tells of friends who no longer call; of being cut off from activity and social stimulation.

He calls it "being buried alive."

"Once you are out of society it doesn't take long for you to lose much of what you may have gained during your period of living an active life. Many people, I have found, feel a little squeemish about visiting a person in a hospital. To some degree it has always puzzled me, but I guess much of it is due to the fear that many people have that they themselves may someday find themselves in the same condition.

"Eighty-and-a-half years of my total confinement of 11 years on this bed have been spent in a convalescent hospital. Much of what I have experienced, regarding the loss of visitors, has taken place during the convalescent hospital confinement.

"The feeling of being buried alive stems from the awareness of the many acquaintances in the fraternal organization of which I was one of the founders. Now I find myself still very much mentally a part of the organization, but completely without reciprocal friendship. It appears as though I am now

more a memory than at one time an active participant.

"A note, a phone call to the hospital, or a call to me personally, since I do have a phone, would be much appreciated.

"At first this was very distressing to me, but now, as I lie here contemplating life and it's many ramifications, I have to a great extent been able to accept this, for I realize that once you are no longer an active participant in society you are also no longer a part of their lives.

"I have found it necessary to divert my thoughts and interests in other directions.

"Life continues to go on despite it's many obstacles."

His isolation is not complete. His wife, whom he calls "devoted and loving," visits him daily to eat dinner with him. He has two good friends who phone or visit from time to time and has people come in and read to him.

His telephone has become a life-line to the outside world. His telephone contacts with the Intercommunity Blind Center in Whittier have been mutually beneficial.

It helps, he says, to maintain his sanity.

"The physical, emotional and mental deterioration begins after a relatively short period of time in a convalescent hospital. The physical deterioration begins more rapidly because of the inactivity. The total incapacitation—and the lack of exercise which would stimulate bodily functions—and the emotional and apparent mental deterioration, or what may appear as a deterioration, occurs more slowly.

"Much of this is due to the anxieties, fears and frustrations which you find yourself constantly experiencing in dealing with the different personalities you are involved with. Also, in getting things accomplished which are necessary to you but not to those involved. Being an independent person by nature, and one who has always been mentally active, I could never bury my head in the sand and allow my mental interests to slide away.

"For several years I maintained a relatively stable mental attitude by taking an interest in my home, and the frequent visits by my wife. Maintaining a social association with her—the social being that of having dinner with her—as well as the enjoyment of being together with her, helped relieve that which was lost as far as mental activity. Her change in working hours and job transfers now made it more difficult for us to continue on this basis.

"There are three fellows whom I contact now and still keep in touch with. To keep myself informed and mentally active I listen to the news, news commentaries, talk shows and cassette tapes. Much of my information and opinions are taken from these sources and in the end I arrive at my own analysis of today's economic and social problems. There are days when you don't mentally function as well as you would like. The thoughts just race through your mind and you never take hold of any one. On these days I enjoy listening to music, allowing myself to mentally stray and reflect on the many pleasant memories my wife and I have shared over the years.

"The mental stimulation is still a very, very important part of my life. I don't want to fall into lengthy periods of fantasy.

"Should this occur I would be in real trouble.

". . . I would be in real trouble."

As if he hasn't trouble enough.

These thoughts, these words, were dictated in a series of articles by the anonymous man; dictated to his wife and given, through confacts with Dr. Zimmerman, to The Daily News. She said that he was interested in having his articles published. "However, I think it might be equally useful for society to know that there are people like him, 'buried alive,' whether through his own words or those of others."

His own words are good enough.

"There are many worries, fears and anxieties which I am still experiencing and always will, as long as I live this type of life. The project of writing these articles has been, to some extent, a trying experience for me. I have opened many wounds which I had closed. This is one thing I have always wanted to do. As long as I am still physically able, and there is a breath still left in me, I will continue to fight.

"For life offers many experiences and we must take out of it that which suits our needs.

"Once you give up living you are through and there is nothing left."

THE AIR BAG ISSUE: SAFETY VERSUS FREEDOM

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Transportation, William Coleman is to be complimented for his judicious approach to resolving the "air bag" issue.

As the ranking minority member of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee, I am painfully aware of the indisputable fact that the use of automobile restraints, such as seat belts and air bags, can save lives. It is dumb not to wear a seat belt, however, in a free society people have a right to do dumb things. While I strongly advocate the use of seat belts, I stop short of mandating them.

I hope the distinguished Secretary of Transportation will give sufficient weight to the argument for individual freedom as he considers the "air bag" question.

Following is an article by James J. Kilpatrick which focuses on this issue.

I commend it to my colleagues.

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 3, 1976]

WHEN IT'S BIG BROTHER WHO BUCKLES YOU IN

In holding fresh hearings on the efficacy of air bags, Transportation Secretary William Coleman this week reopens an old question. As Coleman himself recognizes, the issue goes beyond air bags to the nature of government in a free society.

What is the role of the state? What is the responsibility of the individual? Where is the line to be drawn that separates compulsion from freedom?

The immediate question is what the secretary should do, if anything, about requiring additional safety measures for the design and operation of automobiles. Coleman could leave matters as they are; he could ask for additional testing of protective devices; he could require auto manufacturers to offer air bags to those who want them; he could order the states, under pain of losing certain federal aid, to enact laws compelling the use of seatbelts; or he could require the manufacturers to equip every new car with air bags a couple of years down the road.

To some of us, only one of these five options is consistent with the principles of a free society: doing nothing.

Further testing of air bags is unlikely to produce significant new data. Air bags have been tested for five years, both in controlled experiments and in "real world" situations. In frontal collisions, they seem to work well; the bags inflate upon sufficient impact, and they appear to save lives. In sideswipes and rollovers, they offer virtually no protection. Experts generally agree that shoulder and lap belts—if only drivers and passengers would use them!—offer superior protection.

The other three options smack of coercion. Compelling the state legislatures to enact mandatory seatbelt laws is an odious idea. We went through this same arrogant imposition in the matter of compulsory helmets for motorcycle riders. It took an act of Congress to restore the states' freedom to legislate in this field.

Neither does it make sense—not in a free society—to coerce the manufacturers into offering a particular piece of safety equipment. General Motors, trying to be cooperative, offered air bags as an option on its Oldsmobiles, Buicks and Cadillacs in the 1974, '75 and '76 model years. The company advertised heavily. It hoped to sell 100,000 air-bagged cars in each of the years. In the three model years combined, only 10,000 customers turned up.

The final option, for mandatory installation of air bags in every new car, has been kicked around since 1971 without getting any better. GM estimates the cost of manufacture and installation at roughly $500 per car. The company actually charged the 10,000 customers $315. In volume production, the cost might drop to, say, $250. No one knows, but no one doubts that a mandatory air bag requirement would add significantly to the already high price of a new automobile.

And for what? The requirement would add some measure of lifesaving protection in some accidents. Is the high cost worth the contingent benefit? It seems doubtful. And an intangible price must add to the cost in dollars in furthering the concept that the federal government is the benevolent shepherd, protecting his dumb sheep from their folly.

That concept ought to be resisted whenever it is advanced. The government is not our master, not our mama, not the one great nanny of us all. In a free society, the people must be left free to make their own decisions of this kind. The government's obligation is to make the highways generally safe. When that is done, and the laws against reckless driving are enforced, the government should let the people alone.

LIMIT CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, in its July 1976 Mandate Poll of its nearly one-half million members, the National Federation of Independent Business included a question which asked the respondent's opinion as to whether Members of Congress should have a limited term.

Nationwide, 58 percent of the respondents selected a 12-year limit on terms. 16 percent chose 24 years, 23 percent chose unlimited, 3 percent were undecided.

It has been my experience that the independent small businessmen who belong to the NFIB and who customarily respond to its poll have a good grasp of current affairs and are particularly perceptive about political matters. More than 80 percent of them believe that a Member of Congress should serve for a limited term. Nearly 3 out of 5 say that limit should be 12 years.

I think this poll ought to be food for thought for all Federal elected officials.

PORTRAIT OF TONY ZALE—A GREAT CHAMPION

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasant surprise of a visit from two very close and dear friends from Chicago, Mr. and Mrs. Tony Zale, who had stopped by my Washington office returning from a convention in Trenton, N.J., where Tony had been chosen to head the Association of American Boxing Champions. This organization is dedicated to the helping of mentally retarded children. Tony's leadership and guidance will make a tremendous contribution as 26 years of his life have been spent with youngsters, instilling within them confidence, pride, to gain a purpose in life, and to be worthwhile citizens.

It was a pleasure when having breakfast in the House dining room with Tony and his lovely wife Philomena to see so many Members of the House and House employees receive the "Champ" with such enthusiasm after the passing of so many years.

I am certain many will agree that Tony is one of the all-time great champions of the boxing world. Having been former middleweight champion, coach, and director of the Chicago park district boxing program he is the idol of hundreds of Americans.

As our country has thrilled to the victories of the American Olympic boxers in Montreal, this year, so it thrilled back in 1928, to the performance of our Olympic boxers in Amsterdam. Tony Zale was a schoolboy of 15 at the time, in Gary, Ind., with a hankering for the Golden Gloves competition, hoping to make it to the 1932 Olympics. With that in mind, he entered the amateur ranks in 1930, as a welterweight, and fought his way almost to the top, placing second in the Olympic trials. Two years later he was declared Golden Gloves champion of the middleweight division.

Deserting the amateurs, Tony turned professional in 1935 and was at once engaged against boxers of experience and ability. The going was tough and he lost a few in those early days, but by 1938 he was well on the way. In that year there were two official middleweight champions of the world—Fred Apostoli, recognized by the New York Boxing Commission, and Al Hastak, recognized by the National Boxing Association. Tony Zale was to beat them both, and in 1940 was acclaimed the NBA champion. In 1942 he became sole claimant to both branches of the title and was to hold that distinction for the next 5 years.

With the coming of World War II Tony Zale joined the Navy and served from 1942 to 1945 as a chief specialist at several naval training centers. Upon returning to the ring, in July 1946 he was confronted by the outstanding challenger of the moment, Rocky Graziano, with whom he engaged in one of the three greatest battles of the century, or so we are advised by many experts in the field. The other two greatest battles, the same experts declare, involved these same two fighters—Zale and Graziano—in 1947 and 1948.

The first time out, Tony was the winner, after one of the most furious contests ever witnessed anywhere. Rocky fought with all his usual courage and wild abandon, and gave as much as he got until Tony connected solidly in the sixth round, and Rocky went down for the count. A year later, in June 1947, it was almost a carbon copy of the previous match except that this time it was Rocky who won, with a knockout in the sixth. Then, in 1948, came the rubber match, in which Tony settled the question of who was best, once and for all, flattening Rocky for the full count in the third round.

Those fight fans who were fortunate enough to see any of these matches are inclined to rate them as the best in memory, and the man who came out on top was Tony Zale, the toughest of them all.

And when the end came to his sterling professional boxing career, Tony Zale revealed another aspect of the spirit that had carried him to the top of his chosen profession. As patriots, none can be said to exceed the Zale family whose male members have served the colors at every opportunity. From 1953 to 1956 Tony Zale returned to military service as a boxing coach and master sergeant in the U.S. Army. This, added to his wartime naval experience, gave him 6½ years' service in the National behalf.

As a civic leader Tony is equally active and equally important, to the distinct advantage of the Chicago community where he now resides. He was for 9 years head boxing coach of the Catholic Youth Organization, founded by Bishop Shiel, preceding appointment to his current post as coach of the Chicago Park District boxing program. From 1968 to 1970 he made frequent appearances at Madison Square Garden and elsewhere for church organizations, clubs, and charitable organizations. He takes special pride in his good works undertaken in behalf of mentally retarded children.

During the past 2 years alone Tony Zale has appeared and participated in performances sponsored by the following civil organizations of importance: United States Steel Youth Organization, Boys' Club of America, Mentally Retarded Olympics, Cerebral Palsy Telethon, Veterans' Hospital on Veterans' Day, Mayor Daley Youth Center, Cook County Jail Athletic Program.

In addition, Tony Zale has appeared at many dedication ceremonies and on many radio and television programs, honoring causes of the finest kind, as well as luncheons, smokers, and dinners sponsored by groups of such nature as the Rotary, Lions, Elks, Eagles, Optimists, Shriners, Boosters, and Holy Name.

Tony Zale is presently cochairman of the Fellowship of Champions of the Ezzard Charles Montessori School, a member of the board of directors of the same school, a member of the Citizens Committee on Smoking and Disease, and a member of the board of directors of the Second Federal Savings & Loan Association. He is a member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Veterans Boxers Association, Knights of Columbus, Polish National Alliance, Polish Roman Catholic Union, the Gary Old Timers, and the Elks. He was recently chosen to head the association of former boxing champions, succeeding Jack Dempsey former heavyweight champion of the world.

The trophies and plaques Tony Zale has received for his contributions to the welfare and well being of American youth include those donated by the Catholic Athletic Association of Kalamazoo, the VFW, the Young Democrats of Chicago, the Citizens of Mishawaka and Penn Township, Ind., the St. Rita Dads' Club of Harahan, La., Golden Gloves, Inc., of Duluth, Minn., the Polish Professional Men's Association of Lake County, Ind., and the USA–CIO of Colorado.

The list of honors and awards from organizations, religious groups, and communities throughout the United States are numerous. The award Tony treasures most, however, was the Notre Dame Annual Bengal Bouts which he received in March 1948 as the man in boxing who contributed the most to the youth of America by his example of high ideals and competitive spirit.

A story told here for the first time was mentioned by Tony's wife, Philomena, who was a former great athlete and star pitcher in the late 1930 with the P. K. Wrigley baseball team in the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League in Grand Rapids, Mich. where she played the home games at South Field High School where President Ford played football.

To Tony's credit, one of the youngsters he inspired, guided, and educated and who proudly refers to him as "Father" is now a member of the faculty of Georgetown University in Washington, D.C.

I am exceedingly proud to know this compassionate man, and will cherish this memorable visit with Tony, his love Philomena, and their son.

If I could leave a legacy to the youngsters today it would be to emulate Tony Zale for his morality and dedication.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION OF MISSED VOTES

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, I was in Delaware and missed several recorded votes in the House. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 571, "no."
Rollcall No. 568, "no."
Rollcall No. 569, "aye."
Rollcall No. 570, "no."
Rollcall No. 571, "no."
Rollcall No. 573, "aye."

On August 2, I was in Delaware. Had I been present for the House votes, I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 581, "aye."
Rollcall No. 582, "aye."
Rollcall No. 583, "aye."
Rollcall No. 584, "aye."
Rollcall No. 585, "aye."
Rollcall No. 586, "aye."
Rollcall No. 587, "no."
Rollcall No. 588, "aye."
Rollcall No. 589, "aye."

ARMS OUT OF CONTROL

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the indiscriminate sale of massive quantities of highly sophisticated American weapons to the most volatile areas of the world continues to draw sharp criticism from the Congress and the American people. An editorial in the August 3, 1976, Christian Science Monitor pointed out the dangers inherent in the administration's policy of selling as many arms as it can, regardless of the potential consequences.

The editorial calls upon Congress to exercise its oversight responsibility and bring some direction to a situation which is truly out of control. In the past week alone, we have learned from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the United States has supplied Iran with far more weapons than it can possibly use, necessitating the very dangerous presence of large numbers of American technicians, and from the administration that it intends to repeat this error by selling thousands of sophisticated missiles to Saudi Arabia, which has already purchased over $6 billion worth of weapons from the United States in the past fiscal year.

Until such time as a coherent arms sales policy is articulated, the Congress must exercise its authority under the terms of the Foreign Military Sales Act to prevent such dangerous transactions as the proposed sale of missiles to Saudi Arabia.

The Christian Science Monitor editorial follows:

ARMS OUT OF CONTROL

It is encouraging that public attention has begun to focus on the spiraling of American arms sales abroad. Congress, for one, is watching this development like a hawk. But the fact remains that there is yet no serious effort within the government to look at what is being sold all over the world and to evolve a sensible policy for bringing arms sales under control. The new administration will have to give this matter the highest priority.

It should be no source of pride to the United States that it has become the largest arms seller in the world. Government-to-government exports totaled about $1.5 billion annually a decade ago; the level is now a staggering $9 billion to $10 billion a year. Moreover, the U.S. is no longer peddling hand-me-downs but the newest and highly advanced weapon systems, such as supersonic planes, submarines, and antiship missiles.

Ironically, the United States may be defeating its own goal of enhancing security throughout the world. Not only does this massive outpouring of arms fuel possibilities for regional conflict. As military and diplomatic experts are beginning to realize, and with some alarm, it will become increasingly difficult for the U.S.—or the Soviet Union—to play the role of peacemaker. The ability of the superpowers to maintain world stability is thus being eroded.

Iran is an illustration of the dangers of unrestrained arms selling. A just-released study by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee notes that the Iranians do not even have the skills to operate the sophisticated U.S. weaponry they now have and would be totally dependent on U.S. personnel if they decided to go to war. By 1980, the report estimates, there could be as many as 50,000 Americans in Iran involved mostly in arms programs.

It is doubly disturbing that there has been no close scrutiny of this program because of a secret decision by President Nixon in 1972 to sell Iran all the modern conventional arms it wanted. When one considers the volatility of the Middle East and the potential for wars and oil embargoes in the region, it is astonishing the U.S. has such an open-ended commitment.

Other arms program are equally questionable. The Saudi Arabians are asking for as many as 2,000 Sidewinder interceptor missiles for their F–5s, when experts agree such a number is excessive for the country's defense. Fortunately, as a result of public outcry, the administration will probably scale down its arms request to Congress.

Nor is the Persian Gulf the only turbulent area where arms are accumulating at fast rate. An arms race is under way in black Africa, where the United States is eager to bolster its allies and counter the Soviet arms buildup in Somalia, Uganda, and Angola. And many "third-world" countries are acquiring submarines and missile-armed patrol boats that could be used to impede shipping.

This is not to suggest a criticism of legitimate arms programs. It makes sense for the U.S. to help friendly countries build up their forces so they can defend themselves. There is merit in fostering regional defense systems. Arms agreements often serve valid security objectives—perhaps they do in most cases.

But to accept the present government view of "the more the better" (and the Pentagon, especially, argues that arms sales help the balance of trade and keep unit costs down) is to head down a potentially dangerous path. Some hard thought ought to be given to the nature of the weapons supplied. Are the most lethal arms going to unreliable clients? To what extent are they truly defensive? If they can be used as offensive weapons, what quantity can be justified as needed?

Arms are like shiny toys these days. Everyone wants them. But, as the major supplier in the world, the United States ought to take the lead in showing that it does not intend to turn the world into an arsenal of weapons that could have disastrous consequences.

THANKS TO THE PEOPLE OF MONTROSE, COLO.

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include portions of a letter from an Indiana man bestowing kind words on the city of Montrose, Colo. The letter was forwarded to me by U.S. Representative J. EDWARD ROUSH of Indiana.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: Three weeks ago today, I received a phone call from the head nurse of the Montrose, Colorado Memorial Hospital stating that my 7-year-old daughter had been killed, and my mother critically injured in an auto accident . . . Needless to say, this has been a terrible tragedy for all our family.

My mother, who is 94, is still critical with six fractures in each leg and six cracked ribs . . . in the special care unit of Montrose Memorial Hospital. My wife and I are in Montrose waiting until such time as we can move my mother back to Indiana by air ambulance.

The reason for my letter is not to inform you of the tragedy, but to ask you . . . to find out who is the congressman who represents this congressional district and see that he is given our thanks and gratitude for the way we Indiana people have been treated while in his congressional district. It is hard to single out any one person or group—the doctors, the hospital staff, the sheriff's department and many, many others have and are making our stay here as easy as possible. There are few words to express my thanks for all the help we have been given.

Sincerely,

TOM HISSEM, *Avilla, Ind.*

JIM WRIGHT ON AVIATION

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, my colleague in the House and on the Public Works and Transportation Committee, JIM WRIGHT, has become one of our congressional experts in the field of aviation. Since 1975, when our committee was given responsibility for civil aviation, JIM WRIGHT has made significant contributions in suggesting legislative solutions to aviation problems. As chairman of the Investigations and Review Subcommittee, he held hearings this spring on aviation economics in order that other Members of the House could be apprised of the financial condition of the airlines.

I submit for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, the text of an article written by JIM WRIGHT for the Local Air Transport Yearbook. I think the article offers an excellent accounting of the major issues facing the airline industry:

THE LEGISLATIVE SCENE—A FRESH APPROACH

(By Congressman JIM WRIGHT)

First, let me salute those of you who contribute so much to local and commuter air service in America. No facet of aviation is more vital to "hometown U.S.A.," and few other groups have so much at stake in helping Congress act wisely in the face of demands for new or revised federal air regulations.

The job of the lawmaking branch would be easy if there were a solid consensus on what steps would best serve the long-term interests of the nation at large and your industry in particular. There are, unfortunately, wide areas of disagreement. We in the Congress have no alternative but to weigh all the facts carefully and thoroughly before acting. This we are earnestly attempting to do. We have asked many questions; we have heard weeks of testimony; now, with your continued patience and assistance, we can pursue some answers.

In the reorganization of the House of Rep-

resentatives last year, responsibility for all U.S. civil aviation was transferred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. This committee, on which I serve as Chairman of the Investigations and Review Subcommittee, in previous years has dealt with such enormous federal programs as water pollution control, river and harbor improvements, highways, public buildings and economic development.

We are justifiably proud of many accomplishments in these diverse fields. We hope now to make a significant contribution toward solving problems of aviation. Fortunately, our committee members are no strangers to the business of flying. In last year's FLIGHT YEARBOOK, my friend and colleague, Glenn Anderson, Chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, outlined plans for considering legislation in this vital field. He listed the many members of our panel who either are active pilots or who possess other important experience in aviation. The committee also is supported by energetic and experienced staff.

Our Subcommittee on Investigations has some overlapping membership with Glenn's group. While he deals with new legislation such as the ADAP bill, the investigations group looks at present laws to insure that they are working properly, and to see if they can be improved. Our two subcommittees held joint hearings on aviation economics this spring to learn where the airlines stand financially and if help is needed.

HUNDREDS OF BILLS

A measure of the intense Congressional interest in aviation is reflected in the fact that approximately 800 bills affecting this dynamic industry are now pending before us. The bills range from minor amendments dealing with daylight saving time to a proposal for the complete scrapping of the present U.S. aviation regulatory system.

This flood of ideas made it plain that we could not deal with bits and pieces. We knew we'd have to examine the whole broad mosaic of commercial aviation. We began with a staff study of all pertinent economic aviation statistics. We questioned the best-informed public officials and industry men day by day for several weeks. We invited airline presidents to testify, since we were not content merely to let trade associations tell us in cautious terms what they thought their members wanted or needed. We called only the chief executive officers—men responsible for the future of their companies, with their own careers on the line. They were, I believe, candid in their comments. They gave us a virtually unvarnished look at American aviation today as seen by the people who really run it. We accumulated hundreds of pages of testimony. We will distribute the transcript to policy-makers in Congress, to the Administration, and to the industry as a data bank of information, in the belief that it will be useful to them for years to come.

NO "FLYING PENN-CENTRALS"

Conscious of what happened to the railroads, we decided to try to learn in advance if the country and the Congress were about to be confronted by one or more "flying Penn-Centrals." On the basis of our findings, this seems unlikely—at least for now.

True, the airlines have had tough going. Costs have increased prodigiously. Jet fuel, available at 10 cents a gallon before the Arab embargo, now runs as high as 45 or 50 cents . . . and even more.

The pay of employees, roughly half of airline expenses, has soared. Yet aerospace employees have not benefited particularly, because of the erosion of real wages through inflation. Debt service is a special burden due to the buying, perhaps prematurely, of so many big new planes—and to the almost extortionate interest rates currently demanded by lenders. Primary debt of the trunks alone is over $7 billion, at interest of 11 percent or more!

Smaller items all add up. Since the airlines compete little in price, they vie for passengers with such things as food, drinks, stereos, movies, and extra flight attendants. Such frills may not seem large compared with the cost of equipment—say $6 million for a DC-9 on local service—but the total for non-operating expenses is amazingly high.

Beyond all that, last year's recession cut load factors. The lines were flying many empty seats they had expected to sell. Hard pressed for capital, they found it necessary to cut service and pare expenses drastically.

Traffic gains so far this year, as the economy has experienced a modest revival, have trimmed losses and even brought some modest profits. This means we may not need emergency action. But we must not lapse into complacency.

URGENT TO REMOVE UNCERTAINTY

During the economic oversight hearings, we heard from American, Braniff, Eastern, Pan American, Trans World, United, Air New England, Allegheny, Texas International, Federal Express, Golden West, Flying Tigers, and Pacific Southwest Airlines.

Though these trunks, local, commuter and all-cargo carriers all have separate problems, all are interdependent parts of the air transport system. Out of a diversity of facts and ideas, one common theme was a desire to remove uncertainty and to get on solid ground to plan and build for the years ahead.

The Administration's proposal to uproot the present system of airline regulation has been unsettling not only to future plans but to current financing. Metropolitan Life and Citibank of New York informed the committee that they have traditionally lent capital to the carriers in the belief that route and rate systems would remain secure. All this talk of sweeping deregulation is freezing the airlines out of sources of new capital.

Pending a decision, it will be hard to finance new equipment, to the detriment of the entire industry. In the meantime, seat mile yields continue to deteriorate.

I personally anticipate no major changes in the regulatory system in this present session of Congress. Hearings have been and continue to be held on deregulation proposals, but the issues are much too complex and controversial to be resolved casually or rapidly.

In the meantime, we hope to add a modicum of stability by avoiding precipitant or ill-considered demolition of a regulatory structure that has nurtured the finest system of air transportation anywhere in the world.

SPEEDING UP PROCEDURES

We are concerned, however, by the time it takes to decide cases in the slow-grinding processes of CAB and other government agencies. Route awards at the CAB, for instance, may drag on for a decade or more while the public waits for service. Equally indefensible delays occur in the rule-making and adjudicatory processes at FAA. On the latter point, a good example has been the protracted controversy over noise abatement and who is to pay the cost of retrofit—or even if retrofit is practical and economically sound.

Out of all this, some near-term answers seem to be in improved scheduling to reduce empty seats; reducing some frills; allowing airlines some flexibility in setting fares; and somehow helping the airlines to manage their debt service.

I do not favor bailing out the airlines with tax money, but perhaps something like the old Reconstruction Finance Corporation could be used to help make their debts more manageable, rendering assistance to air carriers as well as to other transportation modes.

The commuter airlines, vigorously growing with a minimum of restraints, need some clear policy as to where they fit in the air transport system. Congress should help define their role just as it did for the local service airlines after World War II.

We in Congress would be derelict if we did not work as diligently as we can on these problems, but we are very much aware that there are no instant or easy solutions.

ANOTHER VOICE OF REASON ON DIVESTITURE

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the growing chorus of voices speaking out on the undesirable economic and practical consequences of breaking up the oil industry, there are still those who seek to obtain political mileage from the public suspicion of "big oil."

These calls for divestiture are not based on reasoned analysis of the nature or the operation of the petroleum industry, but on demagogic appeals to emotions. They represent an unworthy effort by some to find a scapegoat for a situation that is in part the fault of this very Congress. The heart of the problem is not the size of the oil companies, but the failure of Congress to adopt a strong and effective energy policy.

Fortunately, there is increasing evidence that the media and the general public realize this fact. I know in my Connecticut district this is true and more and more voices of reason are being heard throughout the country.

I would like to share with you a particularly cogent and articulate statement of the issue as stated in the Hartford Courant of August 1, which I hope each of my colleagues will take the time to read:

NO MODE FOR OIL CLAMPS

Breaking up the nation's 18 largest oil companies into separate units for production, marketing, refining and transportation is a topic that has been vigorously mulled and debated for months. Literally hundreds of thousands of words and arresting claims have been marshalled in support of and in opposition to the proposal, and the end is nowhere in sight. Basically, it is a matter of attitudes toward bigness—is bigness in and of itself benign or baneful?

As is often the case with efforts to reduce complexities to basics, oversimplification results. Expert proponents and opponents obviously are not concerned only with the enormity of certain oil companies. Their arguments are fraught with economic pluses and minuses which may or may not relate to size. Still, we repeat, it all comes down to the question whether its size makes Big Oil good or bad. We see its positive side.

Admittedly it is difficult to view the question dispassionately, wrapped up as it is with economic interpretations and human applications. In the insecurity of our relatively small individualism, we have built-in urges to cut large forces and shapes outside our sphere down to size. Big Government, Big Labor, Big Oil; they all cast fearsome shadows. So also do many other shapes whose substance often proves less terrifying than the image projected. It's a matter of light, angle and perspective.

Again basically and simplistically, Senate

Bill 2387 which got through the Judiciary Committee by an 8-to-7 vote, is intended to increase competition in the oil industry and thus increase exploration and production and bring down prices. This in an industry where 10,000 companies are seeking, finding and producing oil and gas, where 131 companies operate 284 oil refiners, where the top eight claim only half of the market, an industry which supports 15,000 wholesale distributors and 18,000 suppliers, as well as 190,000 retailers, of whom 95 per cent are independents.

In any consideration of size, let us first consider performance and efficiency. Giants may well move mountains faster and better than ants. Last September, the average cost of gasoline in the United States was 58 cents. At the same time, Australians were paying 84 cents, Belgians $1.48, Britons $1.40, Frenchmen $1.22, Swedes $1.24, Italians $1.72 and Japanese $1.55. If competition is stifled by Exxon, Texaco and the likes of Ashland, then how did Amerada Hess, started after World War II, get into the act and the top 18?

So it's Big Oil. It's fatally possible that it's still not big enough for our 105 million automobiles, our annual demand for 73,121 trillion Btu's of energy, or to provide $100 million ocean tankers, $400 million drilling rigs, $7 billion pipe lines and so on. Chase Manhattan Bank estimates that in the next ten years, the world's petroleum industry will need to invest at least $480 billion to find and develop petroleum, and another $475 billion to transport, process and market it. Hardly a task for Little Oil.

A more technical exposition of the problem would necessarily deal with terms such as vertical divestiture, in essence, as previously stated, the creation of separate entities for the process of getting oil and gas from the ground to the consumer. Also requiring mention would be horizontal divestiture which would prohibit oil and gas companies from owning interests in alternative energy sources such as coal, oil shale, uranium, nuclear reactors, geothermal steam or solar energy. In other words, if not tie the hands of our giants, sap their strength.

This is no time to experiment, legislatively or corporately, on such a vast and critical scale. The oil industry, for all that is known about it, can measure up to the challenge of future needs. What is unknown about it cannot be used to denigrate or undermine it. We cannot risk collapsing this vital process and supplier simply because its bigness awes some, frightens others and annoys a few.

The divestiture bill awaits Senate action late this summer, but with a national election looming in November, it is Congress' turn to see its own fearsome shadows and few expect immediate definitive action on S. 2387. Meanwhile, we have time further to ponder the extravagant rate at which we are wasting oil resources and the energy so produced, to wonder what new ploys OPEC has in mind for our edification and to cap it all, to remind ourselves that Canada, our chief source of imported oil, has lately served notice it intends to close down the valve we cavalierly came to regard as our own.

Big oil, yes. Let's keep it that way. We sure need it to support our own Big Habit—willful use and wanton waste.

FINANCIAL REFORM

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the great interest shown by citizens of Colorado's Second District in the provisions of the Credit Union Financial Institutions Act, incorporated in the Financial Reform Act now under consideration in committee.

Over 750 credit union members in my district have signed petitions requesting Congress:

To permit Federal credit unions to offer millions of members long-term real estate loans, revolving lines of credit, extended repayment periods on consumer, mobile home and home improvement loans, third party payments, and other contemporary financial services.

I understand that the Financial Reform Act is a very complicated and controversial bill. A great deal is at stake; possible repercussions among the various types of financial institutions might result in an unfair competitive advantage by some institutions in the money market. However, I think that some reforms are in order, and on behalf of my constituents, I urge my colleagues on the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing to move in that direction.

H.R. 9719

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, August 5, the House of Representatives will be examining a most important nonpartisan and far-reaching piece of legislation. The impact of H.R. 9719, a bill which deals with the Federal tax-exempt lands, can readily be seen when you consider the fact that one-third of the entire country is federally owned. We have 1,000 counties located in nearly every State that are impacted by federally owned, tax-exempt lands.

Federal ownership of lands compels every local government affected to assume an inequitable burden in attempting to provide basic public services. When land is removed from the tax base because of Federal ownership, local communities are denied tax revenues that they would normally receive under private ownership. As a result, a disproportionate burden is placed upon those local taxpayers who occupy the private property within that county. This manifest inequity should be remedied. In 1970, the Public Land Law Review Commission recommended that:

The Federal Government should make payments to compensate state and local governments for the tax immunity of Federal Lands.

To better assess the impact of the Federal Government's vast land holdings, hearings on H.R. 9719 were held in Washington, D.C., as well as in Nevada—87 percent Federal land holdings—and Utah—67 percent Federal land holdings.

These hearings developed graphic case examples of why H.R. 9719 is needed to relieve the economic inequities created by the Federal land holdings within a county or local jurisdiction. Basic human-need services are under continued economic strain or curtailment. The heaviest burden must be carried, in many instances, by those rural counties that can least afford it. Each year, in many of those counties, there are thousands more visitors than residents, placing demands upon that county's human and fiscal resources. Health care services in many of our large Federal land holding small populated counties is severely impacted by the necessity of providing emergency medical care to transient indigents in need of help.

For example, one hospital located in Humboldt County, Nev., has provided medical assistance to many of the counties transient visitors, but is totally supported by local residents. A county ambulance may have to travel 147 miles to pick up a Federal highway accident victim. If that victim is indigent, local government must absorb the entire cost. General health care service for the local residents is proportionately diminished because there is not enough health care money to do both. With no private land tax base, there is no hope of raising medical money. Local governments must assume almost all of that burden. Because of serious economic constraints created by the absence of 90 to 99 percent of the counties tax base, most rural law enforcement agencies are seriously understaffed and by way of national comparison they are on the lowest end of the law enforcement pay scale.

The counties and municipalities impacted are severely impaired in providing all basic human services. Open dumps cannot be replaced in many small populated counties because there is insufficient budget base upon which to finance installation of a sanitary landfill. There is no money to build expanded sewage facilities. Many so-called county roads are located on the vast Federal land holdings, but the counties simply do not have the economic resources to improve or maintain those roads. Yet there is a constant community and visitor clamor to improve those roads.

Education is suffering in many Federal land dominated counties. Several Nevada counties have been forced because of rising costs and static income to close or contemplate closing rural schools. We have a very unique forced busing problem in our rural communities. White Pine County, Nev., with over 5 million acres, receives only a $30,000 annual land payment from the Federal Government, despite the fact that the Federal Government owns 97 percent of the county. Consequently, county residents rely heavily upon mining industry to maintain any degree of fiscal stability. However, the irregularity of these revenues—a drop from $546,760 in 1974 to nothing in 1976—has forced the school board to begin making preparations to close down schools, as all other channels of revenue have been exhausted.

Humboldt County, Nev., with 5 million acres of unpopulated and nontax producing Federal lands involves an almost unbelievable situation for many

students living in Virgin Valley. In order for these students to attend high school, they must travel 40 miles just to catch the bus, which in turn travels 140 miles over chiefly gravel roads on Federal lands to a high school in Oregon. The students then board the entire week in Oregon, and reverse the process the following Friday. Some elementary school children in this county travel over 120 miles each day—much on gravel roads—to receive their education. I speak in all sincerity when I say that these young people must have the 19th century dedication of Abraham Lincoln to endure what they must for a 20th century education.

It should be emphasized that the county employees who are providing most of the services are averaging less than $600 a month and they are utilizing facilities, that in some instances, their grandparents used. For example, the grade school in White Pine County was built in 1907, and its high school is sixty-six years old. The frustrated Mayor of the county seat of Humboldt County wryly observed that the county jail—

Is so old and rickety that we are thinking of asking the inmates to sign a promise that if they escape, they will restack the bricks.

He adds that a "good portion of the inmates are not locals."

You should remember when the county is 97 percent to 99 percent Federal land, then there is no real possibility of expanding the revenue potentials for that county. There are a multitude of additional problems and restrictions imposed upon agriculture, mining, commercial enterprise growth, community growth, and public access, by the dominance of Federal ownership of nontaxable lands. The Federal Government has forced the counties to walk a worn and frazzled fiscal tightrope, and action must be taken before these counties are completely devastated.

The situation is similar in hundreds of counties across the entire country. The Federal Government simply does not pay what would be required if the land were on the tax rolls; nor does it adequately compensate counties for all the burdens imposed upon them.

It is critical now that we work to overcome these shortcomings and eliminate Federal freeloading at the expense of our local and county taxpayers. I join the committee in declaring that H.R. 9719:

Is a positive and long overdue step toward solving a problem that is seriously straining the fiscal health of this country's county and local governments.

NAVY SHIPS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, I would like to discuss briefly certain matters concerning our naval posture.

Just before the July recess the House and the Senate agreed on the conference report of the Department of Defense Appropriation Authorization Act, 1977. That bill provided $6.6 billion for shipbuilding, including the construction of 17 new naval vessels, 2 conversions, and long leadtime items for a new nuclear powered aircraft carrier.

The ships which were approved for construction were:

One Trident submarine; four nuclear powered attack submarines, eight patrol frigates; one destroyer tender; one submarine tender, and two oilers.

The two conversions were for the *Long Beach*, a nuclear powered cruiser commissioned in 1961 which now has an antiquated weapons system, to become a prototype for the nuclear powered strike cruiser with Aegis antiair war system; and for the *Belknap* which was damaged in the collision with the *Kennedy*. In addition, the conferees approved over $500 million for cost growth, including $320 million for claims, and about $1.1 billion for escalation on prior years programs.

What we omitted from this bill included the nuclear powered strike cruiser and the Aegis destroyer. The 8 patrol frigates were a compromise with the President's supplemental request for 12 of these ships. If you will recall, the House had originally included only four patrol frigates in its bill. On the floor an effort was made to add four more frigates and another effort was made to delete all of the frigates. Both efforts failed—largely on the proposition that we should be building the large complex ships during peacetime as had been suggested by Admiral Moorer. It had also been suggested that the United States should concentrate on the larger more powerful, more complex ships, leaving the smaller and cheaper ships to be built by our allies.

On July 14, when the President signed the authorization bill into law, he issued a statement saying he would resubmit legislation for the nuclear powered strike cruiser and for the Aegis destroyer, as well as for the additional four patrol frigates which had been requested in the fiscal year 1977 supplemental.

I am very pleased that the President has said that he would re-request the nuclear powered strike cruiser. This 17,000-ton ship has the most modern weaponry that the Navy can put on it. In addition to the Aegis antiair war system, it will carry Harpoon antiship and the SM–2 antiair missiles and will be able to carry the sea launched cruise missile—Tomahawk—when it is developed. It will carry two helicopters or one VSTOL plane and will have one eight-inch gun instead of the five-inch. It will have armor to protect all of its vital areas and will be the least vulnerable of any surface ship except the attack aircraft carriers. With its nuclear power, it will be able to get to an area of concern, take care of the situation, and return without having to worry about the logistics of fuel oil.

The Senate had been opposed to the nuclear powered strike cruiser because of its expense. However, the main asset that the United States has is its technology, and all of that technology is on board the cruiser—well protected. The Chief of Naval Operations, in a letter to me, sums up the requirement for the cruiser:

As the most modern and capable surface ship afloat, the strike cruiser is capable of engaging and destroying hostile threats to our continued free use of the seas—either as a major component of the most powerful naval tactical units ever assembled, the all-nuclear powered task force, or operating independently in the remote areas of the world's oceans.

The House had been opposed to the construction of the Aegis destroyer, especially before there was a firm construction line for the cruiser. The Aegis destroyer utilized the hull of the 7,400-ton DD 963 and "shoe-horned" the Aegis system into it, making it a 9,200-ton ship. In this addition, the hull lost 1 foot of freeboard. Instead of being below decks, the computer center and the combat intelligence center were above deck, with only thin aluminum around them. This has led to the conclusion of some Navy studies that the Aegis destroyer is very vulnerable to any enemy fire. In addition, there is not enough extra electrical power available to install the more powerful 8-inch gun in place of the 5-inch gun.

For these reasons the House was cool to the Aegis destroyer. We might yield reluctantly and agree to the construction of this ship if we could be firmly assured that the much more effective cruiser would be built. The cruiser can only have long leadtime items purchased this year—with the balance of the ship being financed next year. The systems analysts in the Government have been throwing obstacles into the path of the cruiser. If they are able to point to the construction of one Aegis destroyer, vulnerable as it may be to enemy fire, they are sure to use that destroyer as a further reason why the cruiser should not be built. As I said before, however, I would be willing to recommend permitting the construction of this destroyer if we are given reliable assurances that the cruiser will be built—and in the numbers required for our Navy.

The House had also been hesitant about voting for more patrol frigates. These ships are designed for convoy duty in the low threat area—defending other ships mainly against submarines. Yet the patrol frigate has been given a rather sophisticated antiair warfare capability and very limited antisubmarine capability. Its hull mounted sonar—which has failed operational evaluation—will be able to detect submarines only out to a distance of 5 or 6 miles when working properly. Its towed sonar is still in research and development. Its helicopter antisubmarine defense can be utilized only if some other source has detected the submarine. We thought the ship to be a prime example of what happens under the design-to-cost principle. Military capability has been sacrificed to financial requirements. Since the Navy says that it needs numbers of ships, the committee will be glad to reconsider the matter upon presentation of proper information from the Navy.

There is no question but that the Navy needs a lot of new ships. The committee has long been trying to get these ships. I hope that the Congress in both Houses will take a further good long look at the very capable invulnerable nuclear powered strike cruiser and approve it. The committee could also then reconsider the Aegis destroyer and the patrol frigate, especially if their capabilities are improved. The committee wants to give the President every possible support in his effort to rebuild the Navy.

COAL LEASING GOES WITH STRIP MINING CONTROL

HON. SHIRLEY N. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mrs. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, today the House reconsiders a very significant and long-term piece of energy legislation—S. 391, the Federal Coal Leasing Amendments Act of 1976.

While there is no doubt that this legislation is necessary to stimulate the development of our Nation's coal resources, and certainly represents Congress' first successful attempt in 56 years to up-date a coal leasing policy, it fails on one very critical point by not including Federal surface mining regulations.

In good conscience, Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote to override the President's veto of this bill; not because I necessarily agree with all of his arguments against this legislation, but because it seems only logical to me that the issues of coal leasing and strip mining control and reclamation must be considered together. For too long Congress has pursued a "fragmented" approach to the many problems which face our Nation. This bill, while containing many needed provisions, once again demonstrates Congress' reluctance to deal with an issue in a logical and uncomplicated manner and should be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the final stretch of a very exhausting and challenging 94th Congress. To base one's vote today, in the hope that this Congress will pass a strip mining bill in the remaining days of the session, leaves too much to chance. For this reason, I will vote to sustain the veto, and I urge those of my colleagues who favor a logical and comprehensive approach to this issue, to do the same.

At this time, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an excellent article which appeared in the August 3 Washington Post, outlining the need for sustension.

LEASING THE WEST'S UNPROTECTED LAND

Last week in Denver, a group of citizens spoke out against what it saw as the raw and relentless power of the federal government to open Western coalfields to energy companies. The Western Coalition, a group of 85 agricultural, environmental and public interest organizations concerned about strip mining and coal development in the eight Rocky Mountain and Northern Plains states, was protesting the Interior Department's June 1 call for nominations for tracts to be considered for new federal coal leasing. It argued, among other points, that the 16 billion tons of western coal already leased to the companies could satisfy national needs for many years. It said also that although the Interior Department did well to ask for the view of citizens, it was impossible for the citizens even to think of participating. Why? "We have 60 days to analyze 92 million acres of federal coal lands and make our nominations for off-limit areas," the coalition explained. "That's one and one half million acres per day. The department requires us, with our meager resources, to provide exhaustive information on why these lands should be protected—the type of information the department has never collected in its decades of existence and billion dollar budgets."

The coalition's outcry is another voicing of a fear, long expressed, that nothing can stop the energy companies, as they roll westward, from repeating the assaults they gave to Appalachia's land and citizens. This fear has a bearing on a related coal issue now before Congress, as it is scheduled to vote (today in the Senate, Wednesday in the House) on whether to override President Ford's veto of the Federal Coal Leasing bill. The legislation establishes a system of deferred bonus payments which allows smaller companies to compete for federal coal leases. At the moment, with the 16 billion tons already leased, the bill's sponsors see their effort as an overhaul of the current system that encourages, among other things, more speculation than production.

In the context of this one vote, strong arguments exist for overriding the veto; as I see it, the Ford administration has allowed itself to be overly influenced by the wishes of the coal lobby, and it is the responsibility of Congress to move, if the President won't. But the choice for Congress is subtler and more complex than a for-or-against-the-President vote on leasing rules. This is because the leasing bill comes only as part of the problem created by the sweep of strip mining across the West. The major fear of agricultural and environmental groups is that Congress may pass the coal leasing bill (if the veto is overridden) and end this session without passing a law providing strip mine controls.

The groups agree that money coming to the Western states under the leasing bill would be needed. The effects of the coal boom have already been seen; they are described by Rep. Teno Roncalio (D-Wyo.): "Many small towns in the Rocky Mountain West are suffering severe impact. Wyoming has skyrocketing rates of divorce. We lead in syphilis and gonorrhea per capita. Alcoholism is rampant. Child abuse is a national disgrace in our Western states. Suicide and mental illness are the impacts we suffer in our boomtown growth."

The coal leasing bill would bring money into the Western states, and the politicians who worked hard to override the veto would be hailed for profitably corralling and lassoing a President. But the fear is that once the leasing bill is passed, many of the same politicians will no longer be as enthusiastic as they once were for a strip mine bill. "The timing is wrong," says Carolyn Johnson, the coalition's coordinator. "We need the revenues of the coal leasing bill, but the timing makes me uneasy. We still don't have a strip mine bill. We are so vulnerable out here—ranchers and farmers—to political and economic pressures. If the coal leasing bill is passed, will that take away support for the strip mine bill? I'm leery."

When Johnson and others talk of the states' needing the money, they talk also of needing other things. They have in mind several provisions in the strip mine bill that are not in the one on coal leasing. No protection exists in the leasing bill for example, for surface owners whose properties lie over federal coal, nor are there mining or reclamation standards to protect land and water resources. The leasing bill is silent on these matters because when being drafted it was known or assumed that they would be covered in the strip mine bill. When it became clear that the strip mine bill was in trouble, the effort was made by Rep. John Melcher (D-Mont.) to combine the bills into the National Coal Production, Leasing and Mine Reclamation Act. It was a sensible idea but was defeated late last year in the House Interior committee 21 to 20. At the moment, a revised strip mine bill is again before the Interior Committee, (cosponsored by more than half its members) but it is separate from the coal leasing bill being voted on this week.

The separation has forced many of those in the coalition into not working to override the veto, even though they still support the bill. This puts them close to an alliance with forces they have bitterly opposed all along: the coal lobby and the Ford administration. Are their fears justified, that if the coal leasing bill is passed and the money flows into the states (however modest those amounts would be) then support for a strip mine bill will fade? Another reason put forward for not supporting the override is that without a leasing bill Congress would bestir itself to go back and pass both the leasing and the strip mine, as John Melcher once tried to do. But little time remains for that.

The angles to these speculations can form any number of political views. Two congressmen who have been involved in the debate all along dismiss the coalition's fears as groundless. Support for the strip mine bill will remain, both insisted. They agree that the strip mine bill should have passed first, but that that failure is no reason to back away from the coal leasing bill.

What is suggested by this debate, and the new positions that some groups have been forced into, is that Congress is again displaying its talent for complicating the simple: that the need for coal can be balanced with the need to protect the land and those living off of it. The tragedies of Appalachia are properly assigned to the coal industry, but it now appears that if similar destruction is moving West, its travel agent may be Congress.

STRAINED RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Canada's recent decision to bar athletes from the Republic of China from participating in the Montreal Olympic Games, and the objections voiced by officials of the U.S. Olympic Committee to that move, underscore a disturbing trend in the relations between our two great countries.

It is of vital importance to both our nations that we make every effort to reverse this trend which seems to indicate a more confrontive tone in our mutual dealings.

An excellent editorial in a recent issue of the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate details the incidents which have given rise to my concern over the seeming erosion of goodwill between the United States and her northern neighbor. I would like to insert the editorial into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues as I know they share my concern about shoring up this widening rift.

RIFT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA DEEPENING

Back in November, 1974, when Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau announced that exports of oil to the United States would be reduced, some observers felt that this was just the tip of the iceberg of chilled relatons between the two countries.

More and more evidence is mounting now to prove that it was.

The latest incident, of course, is the U.S.-Canadian dispute over Taiwan's participation in the Olympic games. That has been settled more or less, but an unpleasant aftertaste remains.

American took the attitude that Canada was bullying a small country for political reasons. Canadians felt they were being bullied by the United States in return. "Our position is a reflection of foreign policy, and I believe it ought to be respected as such," the Canadian secretary of state for external affairs said.

Earlier, last Dec. 15, Trudeau had chastened U.S. Ambassador William J. Porter for having overstepped the bounds of diplomatic propriety by criticizing Canadian policies before news reporters.

Porter, whose assignment in Canada was ending, contended that strains in bilateral relations were arising from Canada's next tax legislation affecting American magazines, from the forced deletion of U.S. commercials from television broadcasts, and plans to nationalize American-owned potash mines in Saskatchewan. He also was critical of Canadian export and pricing policies on gas and oil.

Admittedly, Canada does have a problem in protecting its economic and cultural identity. The great majority of Canada's 22.8 million people live in a narrow strip along the U.S. border. They are, of course, influenced by radio and television stations in Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Seattle and other American cities on the border or close to it.

Moreover, American interests own or have an interest in much of Canada's industry.

In addition to all of these frictions, there is a serious dispute between the two countries over American exploitation of Canadian natural resources. The United States, for example, would like to divert waters from Canada's Arctic rivers to arid areas of the American West. And the U.S. is proposing that the two countries jointly develop and share North America's remaining energy reserves.

Canada has been cold toward both ideas.

As is usual in disputes between neighbors, there appears to be some wrong on both sides. Canada long has been a good friend and a valuable ally and it is discouraging to see the rift in good relations widening incident by incident.

It would be wise to begin mending these broken relations now, before the break becomes irreparable.

MESSAGE TO AMERICA FROM THE TANZANIAN PRESIDENT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the continent of Africa has come to the forefront of American foreign policy considerations. Secretary of State Kissinger has recently visited there and on August 2 made the affairs of that continent the topic of his speech to the National Urban League. In light of this concern it seems logical that we in the Congress, as well as administration officials, should be interested in the sentiments expressed by African leaders.

Below is a thought-provoking statement from the July 26 edition of Time magazine, by Tanzania's President, Julius K. Nyerere. His words strike at the heart of the contradictions inherent in our facile Bicentennial verbiage when applied to our heretofore practiced policies toward Africa.

I recommend the following to my fellow Members' attention:

MESSAGE TO AMERICA FROM TANZANIA'S PRESIDENT JULIUS K. NYERERE

America is a society whose faults are the more glaring because of its admirable openness, because of the principles on which the nation was founded and because of the power which comes from its wealth and its size. It is an inspiration, and a warning, to the world. Poor nations aspire to emulate it, or else they fear it—and sometimes both.

For America is judged by the standards set out in imperishable language in the Declaration of Independence of 1776—which is one of the greatest documents of all time. And America now has a degree of wealth and power which could enable the ideals of its founding fathers to be translated into reality. It should now be possible for all Americans to live in dignity in a society which gives to all its citizens equal freedom and security and equal rights and responsibilities. Certainly, it should now be possible for America to "observe good faith and justice toward all nations" without having to fear for its own independence.

The continual struggle of Americans for the implementation of these principles within America, regardless of race or economic status, is a matter of history and contemporary politics. Much progress has been made over the past 200 years. In particular the Federal Government is now committed to fighting racial discrimination within the U.S. by laws, administrative acts and education. This we recognize; it is vital to the respect accorded to America.

But the gap between the principles and the potential on the one hand and the reality on the other is still frighteningly wide, even within America. Americans of non-European descent are still having to struggle to achieve for themselves their full rights as American citizens, equal with all others. Extreme poverty, and even hunger, exist among a sizable minority of American people. There appears to be almost a breakdown of many of the public and communal services which are vital to civilized life and in respect of which we would expect America to be an example to the rest of struggling humanity.

So countries like mine look at America in its Bicentennial year with admiration and respect, yet a feeling of disappointment for opportunities lost. But we also look at America with fear because of the use to which America's great power is often put, and the extent to which American principles have been flouted in the international exercise of American power.

Americans fought a war for their independence. They fought a civil war to maintain their unity despite the diverse social and cultural origins of Americans. The poor and oppressed of the world therefore expect Americans to understand and support the struggles of other peoples to be free and united, even if freedom and unity cannot be won peacefully. We expect that America will be the last nation, not the first, to try to thwart, pervert or destroy the real independence of other nations.

Instead, during the 15 years of our own national existence, we in Tanzania have witnessed American military power being used in an attempt to crush the national liberation struggles of Viet Nam and Cambodia. In some Latin American countries we have seen American economic power being used to frustrate the democratic will of the people about their own form of government. We have felt the effects of America's direct and indirect, but very powerful, support for the racist and colonialist forces of southern Africa. And we have seen American power time and again being used to fight freedom on the plea that it is fighting Communism.

Further, as poor nations like Tanzania struggle for those structure changes in the world economic system which are essential if our own efforts for development are not to be nullified, we find that American economic might is ranged on the other side—that is, on the side of our continued exploitation. Only minor reforms, or economic aid, are offered; sometimes even these are made conditional upon what America regards as our good political behavior in the United Nations and elsewhere. So the poor nations fear America and we struggle against America, even while we admire the great principles of America and her people's achievements. We watch with respect, sympathy and anxiety—and sometimes almost with despair—as Americans endeavor to cope with the political and moral results of their own wealth-creating economic system, and to give international meaning to the principles laid down by the founding fathers of their nation.

For it is this one thing, above all, tha really gives hope to the world. There ar Americans of all colors and creeds who con tinue to struggle for equality and justic within America for all its peoples. There wer Americans who used the time given by th dogged resistance of the Indochinese people in order to reassert the principles of democracy and equality and to oppose America imperialism in Southeast Asia. It was Amer cans who revealed, and who opposed, what was being done by their nation in Chile. And Americans are now working to get American support ranged on the side of national freedom and human equality in southern Africa.

Americans have created a power which is frequently abused internally and externally. But Americans continue to struggle against these abuses and for the survival of the universal principles enunciated in 1776. There is therefore still hope that America's great power will be used for human beings everywhere, rather than simply for the preservation and creation of American national wealth.

From Tanzania we salute America on its 200th anniversary. We send our good wishes for a future of American cooperation with the rest of the world on the basis of freedom, equality and justice, for all men and all nations.

VOTING RECORD

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in a continuing attempt to provide my complete voting record for the first session of the 94th Congress for the benefit of anyone who would like to examine that record, I would like to have printed here my votes on bills ranging from Appropriations Rescissions for Fiscal Year 1975 to bills pertaining to the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3260—APPROPRIATIONS RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

Substitute amendment approving $664,-723,840 in appropriating rescissions requested by the President and rejecting one for $284,-

719,332 for Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Program, rejected 127–268, *aye;* Amendment to approve rescission request of $122,900,000 appropriation for 12 F–111 fighter bombers, adopted 230–164, *aye.*

Final passage, a bill to rescind $222,550,000 in FY 1975 appropriations and to limit spending by GSA by $20,022,900, passed 389–3, *yea;* 2–25–75.

Conference report to rescind a total of $243,359,370 in FY 1975 appropriations from several Federal Departments and agencies, adopted 346–59, *yea;* 3–25–75.

H.R. 4075—APPROPRIATIONS RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

Amendment to approve rescission for HEW, $259,380,000 for FY 1975, rejected 132–252, *aye.*

Final passage, a bill to rescind $16,454,704 in appropriations from Federal Departments and agencies for FY 1975, passed 371–17, *yea;* 3–10–75.

H.R. 6573—APPROPRIATIONS RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

Final passage, a bill to rescind $17,873,000 in appropriations from three health programs for FY 1975, passed 379–1, *yea;* 5–12–75.

H. CON. RES. 218—FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976

Amendment to provide for a 9.8% reduction of the deficit and a 2% reduction of outlays, adopted 227–128, *aye;* Amendment to a substitute amendment to raise revenue target by $3 billion by closing tax "loopholes," adopted 277–128, *no;* Amendment to substitute amendment to balance outlays and revenues for FY 1976 at $299.5 billion and limit budget authority to $300 billion, rejected 94–311, *aye;* Substitute to an amendment to reduce budget deficit to $54.1 billion, rejected 159–248, *aye;* Amendment to place House on record as favoring lifting cost-of-living increase limits on Social Security benefits and other income support programs, adopted 234–171, *no.*

Final Passage, a resolution to set overall targets for FY 1976 budget at $368.2 billion in outlays and $298.1 billion in revenues with a resulting deficit of $70 billion, adopted 200–196, *nay;* 5–1–75.

Conference Report on FY 1976 budget setting fiscal targets: $367 billion in outlays, $395.8 billion in budget authority, $298.2 billion in revenues, and a deficit of $68.8 billion, with a public debt level of $617.6 billion, adopted 230–193, *nay;* 5–14–75.

H. CON. RES. 466—SECOND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976

Substitute to an amendment to lower the budget authority in FY 1976 by $71.9 billion and lower outlays by $71.9 billion, thereby eliminating the deficit and creating a balanced budget and, thus, lowering the public debt by $72 billion, rejected 127–283, *aye;* Amendment to increase the new budget authority by $7.5 billion, and increase outlays, the deficit and the public debt by $1 billion, adopted 213–203, *no;* Substitute to an amendment to lower new budget authority by $12.5 billion, and lower the budget outlays, the deficit and the public debt by $4.7 billion, rejected 159–257, *aye.*

Final Passage, a resolution to set ceilings of $374.9 billion on FY 1976 outlays and $409 billion on budget authority; set a floor of $301.8 billion on revenues; set $73.1 billion as the budget deficit and $620.5 billion as the public debt, adopted 225–191, *no;* 11–12–75.

Conference Report on FY 1976 Congressional Budget Resolution to set ceilings for FY 1976 of $374.9 billion for outlays and $408 billion for budget authority; set $74.1 billion as the federal deficit, with a $300.8 billion revenue floor and $622.6 billion public debt; set separate targets for the July–September 1976 transition period, adopted 189–187, *nay;* 12–12–75.

H.R. 8578—INCREASE IN FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Final Passage, a bill to increase the Federal share of funding for community action programs serving the poor to 80% through FY 1977, passed 244–172, *nay;* 11–19–75.

S. 555—CONSOLIDATED FARM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

Final Passage, a bill to extend coverage of the emergency loan program for farmers, ranchers and certain other victims of natural disasters and to modify Farmers Home Administration procedures for dealing with natural disasters, passed 403–0, *yea;* 7–9–75.

Conference Report adopted 398–0, *yea;* 7–25–75.

H.R. 9509—CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ACT OF 1975

Final Passage, a bill to establish within the Department of Labor a committee composed of labor and contractor representatives to assist in negotiating new contracts to stabilize the collective bargaining process within the construction industry, passed 302–95, *nay;* 10–7–75.

H.R. 6971—CONSUMER GOODS PRICING ACT OF 1975

Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to repeal Federal antitrust exemptions for state "fair trade" laws that allowed manufacturers to set the retail prices of their products, agreed to 380–11, *yea;* 7–21–75.

H.R. 6844—CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

Amendment to allow the Consumer Product Safety Commission to regulate defective firearms and ammunition and labeling on firearms and ammunition, rejected 80–339, *no;* Amendment to prohibit the Commission from including product sampling plans as part of mandatory product safety standards, except in the case of glass bottles or products subject to flammability standards, adopted 200–193, *no;* Motion that the Committee of the Whole rise, agreed to 240–133, *no;* Amendment to delete a provision of the bill that would permit the Commission to choose, on a case-by-case basis, which of the four major laws it administered to use in regulating a product, rejected 204–205, *aye;* Amendment to allow the House or Senate to disapprove within thirty legislative days standards, rules and regulations proposed by the Commission, adopted 224–180, *not voting;* Amendment to authorize private parties to bring civil suit against the Commission during a two-year experimental period, rejected 166–230, *aye;* Amendment to delete a provision of the bill authorizing the Commission to conduct its own civil litigation independently of the Justice Department, adopted 209–195, *yea;* Motion to recommit the bill to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with specific instructions to report it back with an amendment to delete a provision that would permit the Commission to choose which of the four laws it administered to use in regulating a product, agreed to 204–198, *yea.*

Final Passage, a bill to authorize $193 million for the Consumer Product Safety Commission in FY 1976–78 and amend the Consumer Product Safety Act, passed 313–86, *yea;* 10–22–75.

H.R. 7575—CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1975

Amendment to exempt businesses that have less than $1 million in net assets or 25 or fewer full-time employees from the requirement to answer interrogatories issued by the Consumer Protection Agency, adopted 401–6, *aye;* Amendment to require that all Federal agency consumer functions similar to those in the proposed agency be transferred to the new agency, adopted 379–27, *no;* Amendment to delete a provision that would prevent the proposed agency from intervening in labor-management disputes or negotiations in which the Federal government was involved, rejected 175–233, *aye.*

Final Passage, a bill to create an independent Agency for Consumer Protection to coordinate Federal consumer protection activities and represent consumer interests before other Federal agencies and the courts, passed 208–199, *nay;* 11–6–75.

H.R. 8835—TRUTH IN LENDING ACT

Final Passage, a bill to require companies leasing consumer goods to disclose fully the terms and costs of the lease, passed 339–41, *not voting;* 10–28–75.

H.J. RES. 219—FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

Final Passage, a resolution to provide continuing appropriations for Foreign Aid programs until 3–31–75 and for HEW programs and Community Service Administration until 6–30–75, agreed to 308–75, *nay;* 2–25–75.

H.J. RES. 449—CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976

Final Passage, a resolution making continuing appropriations through the *sine die* adjournment of the 1st Session of the 94th Congress for Federal agencies and departments whose regular fiscal 1976 appropriations had not yet been enacted, passed 400–16, *yea;* 6–17–75.

H.R. 6676—CREDIT USES REPORTING

Final Passage, a bill to require the Federal Reserve Board to obtain reports from the nation's 200 largest Federally insured commercial banks on the amount of loans they were making in certain categories, rejected 183–205, *nay;* 6–23–75.

H.R. 6799—AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

Amendment to let the prosecutor rather than a judicial officer determine whether a warrant or a summons should be issued, adopted 216–201, *aye;* Amendment to delete the proposal that would permit defendants to obtain the names, addresses and criminal records of all government witnesses scheduled to testify against them, rejected 199–216, *aye.*

Final Passage, a bill to revise the rules governing Federal criminal cases, including pre-trial and post-trial procedures, passed 372–1, *yea;* 6–23–75.

H.R. 2634—TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Final Passage, a bill to temporarily increase the public debt limit by $131 billion until June 30, 1975, passed 248–170, *yea;* 2–5–75.

H.R. 7545—TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Amendment to end the distinction between the permanent and temporary debt ceilings, rejected 79–315, *aye;* Substitute to an amendment to reduce to $199,990,000,000 from $216.1 billion the temporary debt limit provided through June 30, 1976, and set the overall debt ceiling at $599.99 billion, adopted 314–83, *aye.*

Final Passage, a bill to increase the federal debt limit to $599.99 billion through June 30, 1976, rejected 175–225, *yea;* 6–16–75.

H.R. 8030—TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Final passage, a bill to increase the temporary federal debt ceiling to $577 billion and to extend it to November 15, 1975, passed 223–196, *yea;* 6–24–75.

H.R. 10049—TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Final passage, a bill to extend the temporary federal debt ceiling through March 31, 1976, and raise the limit to $597 billion from $577 billion, rejected 178–217, *not voting;* 10–29–75.

H.R. 10585—TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Final passage, a bill to increase the temporary federal debt limit to $595 billion and extend it through March 15, 1976, adopted 213–198, *nay;* 11–12–75.

H.R. 6674—DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976/197T

Amendment to delete $260.25 million for AWACS Command Control Systems, rejected 136–260, *no;* amendment to delete $22 million for the conversion of civil reserve air fleet, rejected 100–293, *no;* Amendment to delete $77 million for procurement of B–1 bomber, rejected 164–227, *no;* Amendment to prohibit flight testing on the maneuverable re-entry vehicle (MARV) on the ballistic missile system, rejected 124–276, *no;* Amendment to reduce U.S. forces stationed overseas by 70,000 by September 30, 1976, rejected 95–311, *no;* Amendment to provide 5,000 additional civilian personnel for the Department of Defense, rejected 96–300, *no;* Amendment to an amendment to direct the Secretary of Defense to study the feasibility of establishing a separate academy to train women for careers in the armed forces, rejected 113–284, *no;* Amendment to permit women to enroll in the U.S. Military, Naval and Air Force academies on the same basis as men, adopted 303–96, *aye;* Amendment to reduce the Armed Services Committee-approved authorization for procurement and development of new weapons systems to $24.65 billion from $26.54 billion, rejected 183–216, *no;* Amendment to direct the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress every 30 days on contracts, subcontracts and grants entered into by the Department of Defense, rejected 51–345, *no.*

Final passage, a bill to authorize $26,545,023,000 in FY 1976 appropriations for Defense Department weapons procurement, research and development programs and $5,479,017,000 for the budget transition period, and setting active duty strength at 2,100,000 men, passed 332–64, *aye;* 5–20–75.

Conference report on the bill to authorize $31,120,000,000 for military procurement in FY 1976 and the three-month transition period, adopted 348–60, *yea;* 7–30–75.

H.R. 9861—DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976/197T

Amendment to add $5 million to the bill for Army recruiting counseling services, rejected 112–296, *no;* Substitute amendment to an amendment restoring $15.6 million cut by the Appropriations Committee for Army recruiting activities, rejected 177–228, *no;* Amendment to require disclosure of the funds appropriated for the CIA contained in an Air Force account in the bill, rejected 147–267, *no;* Amendment to delete $58.3 million recommended for research and development of the F–18 Navy combat fighter aircraft, rejected 173–243, *no;* Amendment to prohibit use of funds in the bill for relocation of the National Oceanographic headquarters from Suitland, Maryland to Bay St. Louis, Mississippi, adopted 219–193, *no;* Amendment to prohibit use of any funds in the bill to close any military installations designated in the amendment, rejected 130–274, *no;* Amendment to forbid funds for the relocation of the National Oceanographic Office headquarters of the Navy from Washington, D.C., suburbs to Bay St. Louis, Mississippi, rejected 190–220, *nay.*

Final passage, a bill appropriating $90,219,045,000 for the Department of Defense for FY 1976 and $21,674,571,000 for the budget transition period (July–Sept.) 1976, passed 353–61, *yea;* 10–2–75.

Conference report on the bill to appropriate $90,466,961,000 for Defense Department programs in FY 1976 and $21,860,723,000 for the budget transition period, adopted 314–57, *yea;* 12–12–75.

H.R. 10031—DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1975

Final Passage, a bill to extend through 1976 the Defense Production Act, which provides the President with the authority to stimulate industrial production and to assure priority use of vital supplies of any goods during national emergencies, passed 318–1, *yea;* 11–14–75.

Conference report on the bill to extend the Defense Production Act through fiscal 1977, to amend its antitrust immunity provisions, and to require cost-benefit assessments of standards proposed by the Cost Accounting Standards Board, adopted 404–4, *yea;* 12–3–75.

H.R. 10024—DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS AMENDMENTS OF 1975

Amendment to delete provisions of the bill that would allow financial institutions to offer their customers "negotiable orders of withdrawal (NOW)" accounts, adopted 218–134, *not voting paired for;* Amendment to delete provisions of the bill that would require lenders in metropolitan areas to disclose the amount of mortgage money they lend for a tract or zip code area in a city, rejected 152–191, *not voting;* Amendment to limit disclosure of mortgage lending data for city neighborhoods to lenders in twenty metropolitan areas selected by the Federal Reserve Board for a three-year study, rejected 165–167, *not voting.*

Final Passage, a bill to extend the authority of federal bank regulatory agencies to set ceilings on the amount of interest paid on savings accounts by financial institutions to December 31, 1977, from December 31, 1975, and to require lenders in metropolitan areas to disclose the amount of mortgage money they lend for a four-year period after enactment within each census tract or zip code area in a city, passed 177–147, *not voting;* 10–31–75.

H.R. 4005—DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES AMENDMENTS OF 1975

Final Passage, a bill to authorize $188.75 million in FY 1975–77 for Federal programs to aid those with developmental disabilities such as mental retardation and cerebral palsy, passed 398–5, *yea;* 4–10–75.

H.R. 10035—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

Final Passage, a bill to establish an annual conference of judges, private practitioners and law professors from the District of Columbia, passed 337–0, *yea;* 11–10–75.

H.R. 4287—TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL LAW CLERKS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

Final passage, a bill to authorize $150,000 annually for nine additional law clerks for the judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, passed 310–21, *yea;* 11–10–75.

H.R. 10041—REPEAL OF NATIONAL CAPITAL SERVICE AREA ACT

Final passage, an amendment, in the nature of a substitute for the bill, to retain federal control over certain areas of D.C. where Federal offices were located and to delegate to the President authority to appoint an official within the Federal government to serve as director of the National Capital Service Area, which had authority over the Federal enclave, adopted 201–150, *yea;* 11–10–75.

H.R. 9958—TRANSFER OF CERTAIN U.S. PROPERTY TO THE REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Final passage, a bill to transfer certain federal property in the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, passed 341–0, *yea;* 11–10–75.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENT OF EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, I have long supported the concept of full financial disclosure by public officials and introduced legislation both in the first session of the 93d Congress and again in this 94th Congress specifically requiring all Congressmen to issue public personal financial statements.

This requirement, administered on an equitable across-the-board basis, would be a substantial step toward helping to establish a more open relationship between officeholder and constituent. It would help to reduce, I am convinced, some of the skepticism that now exists.

Members of Congress, especially in what appears to be an "anti-Washington" election year, have an opportunity, and a responsibility, to help dispel distrust and to encourage a renewed faith in our system of government and those who participate in it.

Accordingly, while full public financial disclosure by Members of Congress is not currently required by law, in recognition of the public confidence entrusted to me by my constituents, I am submitting for publication the following data concerning my personal assets for 1975. I hope that all congressional candidates in New Jersey will issue similar public financial reports.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

SUMMARY

My Net Worth, based on holdings of both Congressman and Mrs. Edwin B. Forsythe during 1975, was $225,911.

I paid $9,541 in income tax in 1975, on a gross income of $46,454. Of this amount, $42,850 was salary, and I received $3,604 in interest, dividends, fees and honorariums.

LISTING OF ASSETS

Cash on hand and in bank accounts	$34,875
Cash surrender value of life insurance	30,000
U.S. Government retirement account program	17,292
Securities of publicly held corporations	28,100
Other securities	64,244
Real estate (residence)	32,400
Home furnishings	12,500
Personal automobiles	3,000
Office equipment	3,000
Total assets	225,911

LISTING OF SECURITIES HELD IN PUBLICLY HELD CORPORATIONS

Securities and number of shares

Amtek	22
A T & T	6
American Express	90
Arizona Public Service	26
Atlantic City Electric	119
Bank of America	24
Chessie System	10
Columbia Broadcasting System	10
Continental Can Company	44
Exxon Corporation	10
Investment Trust Boston	1183.934
Massachusetts Investment Trust	39.078

Midlantic Bank Inc	41
Philadelphia Electric	10
Public Service Electric and Gas	27
Strawbridge and Clothier	11
Utah Power and Light	18
Warner Co	33
Wellington Fund	187.045
Miscellaneous Stocks	30
Total value	$28,100
OTHER INVESTMENTS	
D.G. Brown Inc. (dairy store)	$1,200
Locust Lane Farm Dairy, Inc	53,600
Locust Lane Farm Dairy (partnership)	9,244
George D. Wetherill	200
Total	64,244

HAMILTON SUPPORTS VETERANS LEGISLATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the 94th Congress has taken several steps toward improving the services and assistance available to eligible veterans, all of which I have supported.

Several bills have already become law. First, a bill providing an 8 percent cost-of-living adjustment and an increase of $300 in the level of income allowed before decreasing the amount of the veteran's pension payment was signed into law last year. It raised the income limitation for a veteran with dependents to $4,500. This bill provided an interim response to the need for new pension legislation, giving veterans relief until September 1976, when present provisions expire.

Second, a bill increasing by 10 to 12 percent the disability compensation to veterans suffering service-related disabilities was passed into law. Survivors of disabled veterans received a 12 percent increase under the bill, and clothing allowances were adjusted upward.

Third, in an attempt to enhance recruitment and retention of qualified doctors and dentists in VA institutions, special pay rates were authorized

Fourth, the Veterans' Home Loan Amendments of 1976 recently became law, making important changes in the veterans' housing program. The maximum direct home loan was increased from $21,000 to $33,000 and the maximum guarantee of mobile home loans raised from 30 percent to 50 percent. The amendments also liberalized eligibility and made other needed changes.

Several bills have passed the House and await further action in the Senate. These include:

First, a bill to increase by 8 percent the disability compensation paid to veterans, their widows, and survivors. The bill also provides for additional compensation to the disabled veteran whose spouse is in a nursing home or requires regular aid and attendance.

Second, a bill to increase the amount payable to States as reimbursement for money spent on medical care and treatment for veterans in hospitals, nursing homes, and home care. The bill also would expand eligibility for such payments.

Third, a bill to provide medical care to survivors of totally disabled veterans even after a non-service-related death.

Fourth, a bill to extend educational benefits to eligible veterans from 36 to 45 months.

Fifth, a bill requiring an annual investigation by the VA of travel costs to veterans, to more equitably calculate the appropriate reimbursement rates for those traveling to VA institutions for assistance.

Of great importance in the next weeks is the formulation of new pension program guidelines, to replace those provisions which are scheduled to expire in September. The House and the Senate have each passed a bill dealing with reforms in this program, and differences between the two bills must now be reconciled.

The legislation already enacted, and that which awaits further action with a good chance of passage, constitute a package of improvements that illustrates that veterans have not been forgotten by the 94th Congress.

WORKERS NEED PROTECTION FROM HAZARDS OF THE WORK PLACE

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the transcript of the July 27, 1976, radio program, the Labor News Conference, in which the participants discuss the danger to hundreds of workers from dangerous chemical substances in the workplace. This program is particularly timely since the House will vote on the Toxic Substances Control Act, H.R. 13042, next week.

TRANSCRIPT

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The following time is presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System.

HARDEN. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL–CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL–CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guests are Dr. Thomas F. Mancuso, medical consultant to the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, AFL–CIO, and Sheldon Samuels, director of health, safety and environment for the AFL–CIO Industrial Union Department.

Millions of union members work in job-environments where chemicals used in work processes can and do disable and kill. Dr. Mancuso, medical consultant to the Machinists Union, is the author of a new book, "Help for the Working Wounded"—a question and answer guide to help workers recognize, evaluate and control occupational diseases and hazardous work. Here to question him and Mr. Samuels about that book, how it came into being and how it is intended to be used, are Sandra Dagler, managing editor of Occupational Safety and Health Report, a publication of the Bureau of National Affairs, and Jerome Brazda, editor of Washington Report on Medicine and Health. Your moderator, Frank Harden.

And now, Mr. Brazda, I believe you have the first question?

BRAZDA. Dr. Mancuso, your book reads like a collection of horror stories. Society now is becoming more aware of the unhealthful conditions in the working places, yet the hazards seem to be increasing with increasing technology. Who is winning?

MANCUSO. No one is winning—I think everybody is losing—the industrial population is losing and, I think, the society is losing.

We have had a tremendous onslaught on the work environment of many thousands of industrial chemicals, whose toxic and cancer-causing effects have not been established. The difficulty lies with the fact there never was any legal requirement to pretest the chemicals before they were introduced into the work environment.

BRAZDA. You are talking about chemicals—does your book deal with chemicals or with hazards, like falling logs, and machinery and so forth?

MANCUSO. It's primarily concerned with toxic dust, fumes, vapors, mists, gases and noise—the impact of the micro-chemical environment, the chemical environment, in distinction from the accent in the past on accidents.

What we want to emphasize, really, is that in the past, the primary emphasis has been on the traumatic injury, what has occurred, what you can see on the job, the immediate cause and effect relationship. What I'm concerned about, what the workers are concerned about, and what society is concerned about are the health effects—which may or may not be immediate—chemical effects can be immediate—but also the delayed effect that may occur 10, 20, 30 years from now.

I'm concerned about the fact that the industrial population is becoming seeded with the chemicals, and that the delayed effects on the kidneys, lungs, liver, and so on and so forth, will occur years later and the basic problem is, who is going to recognize them?

DAGLER. It seems that we've known about the hazards of asbestos for a good many years, even prior to the passage of the Occupational Safety and Health Act. Yet workers presently still don't feel that they are protected. What comes after the awareness?

MANCUSO. Well, awareness must be developed, and this is what we are trying to accomplish with the book really—to develop an awareness among the workers of the toxic nature of the various chemicals to which they are exposed.

Once the awareness has developed, motivation follows. And what we are doing, in effect, is informing the worker and his family, particularly his wife. I was very pleased to see the tremendous response that we are getting from the wives of the workers who read the columns in the Machinist paper, and whose interest is, of course, in protecting their families.

So we feel the motivating force will be generated by the industrial population itself, by the unions, to bring about the control measures which are not instituted at the present time.

BRAZDA. Let me ask you a question, Mr. Samuels—the Occupational Safety and Health Act was generally regarded as a leading answer of this great problem. Is the law inadequate—do we have a long way to go?

SAMUELS. It isn't that the law is inadequate, but, as Dr. Mancuso pointed out, awareness alone is not the answer.

The fact that there is a segment of society—a vocal segment of society—that actually expects workers to die for the right to work. This resulted in political impediments to the exercise of rights—not only the right to know, but also of other OSHA rights.

For example, the White House has taken over key decisions in the implementation of the Act by taking over key segments of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. For example, the White House has approved a re-organization of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission that permits the chairman to stifle the dissent of the labor members.

And if you ask yourself where these political impediments come from, we have to go back to that segment of society which is represented, for example, by the American Conservative Union. The ACU has a new project called "Stop OSHA," they say it's the first time they have had a project like this, but actually, it is similar to a project run by the John Birch Society, when the Act first went, into effect, called "Nix on OSHA."

BRAZDA. That was an unfortunate selection of terms, wasn't it?

SAMUELS. Yes, it was—it was symbolic of the times.

MANCUSO. And apropos of what you are discussing, and this evidently has been going on for decades, what must be developed is the right of the worker on the job to know what chemicals he or she is being exposed to and how to protect themselves and their families. This is a basic right.

DAGLER. Dr. Mancuso, do the workers, right now, exercise this right? The Occupational Safety and Health Act, when it was enacted, said that there would be regulations telling workers what they were exposed to.

MANCUSO. The problem, unfortunately, is that the worker is not being informed by the company as to the toxic chemicals to which he's being exposed.

In other words, the law is not being complied with.

It is one thing to have a law, but if you can't implement it, or if the roadblocks are set in such a way that the regulations are not carried out, the law has no meaning. The point is, workers themselves must therefore bring about implementation. And the only way they can do that is to become sufficiently informed themselves, so they will know the difference on the job and can demand or request that the information to which they are entitled be provided to them.

BRAZDA. Dr. Mancuso, have you found that in some cases workers resist complying with the laws, or resist following safety practices? Maybe they find mouthpieces uncomfortable or helmets ungainly to wear.

MANCUSO. I have not really found that at all—I've heard that story used several times, particularly by industry—for example, that they see a particular problem and they want respirators used, and then they use the excuse that the workers don't want to use the respirators.

But that isn't the point. The point is, they should control the environment so that respirators are not necessary—in other words, there are industrial ventilation control procedures, there are manufacturing processes, that will control the problem. The idea of relying upon the respirator as a control measure is false.

DAGLER. Mr. Samuels, one of the current concerns now is women in the workplace—concern for the unborn child. Dr. Mancuso, in his book, recommends pre-employment physical examination. How does the labor movement feel about pre-employment examinations and about women in the workplace, as far as equal employment opportunities go?

SAMUELS. Well, it is very important that we always determine the workers' ability to perform a task, so pre-employment examinations are important.

However, there are other rights of workers which simultaneously need to be protected—the right of a woman to have a workplace in which she and her unborn baby are safe—and, I might say, the right of a man not to have his basic genetic makeup changed so that it would affect his children. There are rights which we can not permit to be violated.

If you have adequate standards, you protect not only the women in the workplace, but also the men.

MANCUSO. I'd like to add to that particular point, because what it emphasizes is the tremendous range of the scientific unknowns, relative to the industrial chemical environment.

There never have been the thousands of studies necessary to determine what has happened to the workers and what will happen to them.

This particular area that you are discussing is extremely important, but has been totally neglected.

The animal experimental work that has been done in the past has not been effective, has been found not to be sensitive enough to detect the harmful effects. As a result, we're basing our present operation on inadequate, crude, experimental evidence of the past.

What needs to be done is a tremendous effort to identify and study industrial chemicals, not only individually, but in combination.

Another point relative to this—recently, some experimental work was done in which they took industrial material of a fire-retardant polyurethane material and subjected it to heat. They found out it liberated a highly toxic chemical that was six times more toxic than the chemical warfare agent and more toxic parathion, which is a toxic insecticide. The point is, it is not only the thousands of industrial chemicals that are being introduced into the work environment, but also the thousands of industrial chemicals that are being liberated when these materials are subjected to heat or other processes which, in turn, have not been tested for their toxicity or carcinogenic effects. So in effect, the industrial population of society as a whole, which has to pay this price, is subjected to a tremendous number of scientific unknowns.

BRAZDA. Well, Dr. Mancuso, what does the worker do? He is working in a plant where there may be a toxic substance present—it may be odorless—it may be a dust that is virtually invisible. Does he become suspicious at all times? What does he look for? And, having found something that he may find suspicious, how does he detect this? And then, what does he do with the information?

MANCUSO. Well, first what we are trying to do with this book, "Help for the Working Wounded", is the first approach in developing a means of recognition among the industrial population as to what's happening to him and his fellow workers.

There are other stages of development relative to this recognition that we can foresee. I would recommend that in each plant they develop a toxic materials manual, in which, at each plant, there would be recorded all of the chemicals being used at that particular plant, all the chemical components of those trade-name products, the toxicity, the symptoms, and the preventive and control measures. This manual would be available to the worker and to his health and safety representatives—and, of course, to his doctors—so that the worker then has access to what is really being used in his plant and the best methods to control it.

DAGLER. Dr. Mancuso, do you feel the plant physicians and the plant nurses are sharing the information on worker exposure? I know that a number of years ago, the American Medical Association was trying to do some research on various chemicals and it got no response from plant physicians—or very little response. Is this a concern—because the physician is paid by the company—or what is the problem?

MANCUSO. There are several problems in your question. One, of course, is that the person—the key person—who is in a position to recognize the occupational disease in the plant is the industrial nurse. But unless the industrial nurse is trained in occupational diseases, she is not going to recognize this.

Secondly, the physician in the plant, who is really recruited from general practice to provide the industrial medical service—unless he is trained in occupational diseases and the recognition of occupational diseases—is not going to recognize them either.

So basically, we must recognize the fact that a system must be developed—that there be an on-going program for the training of industrial nurses and the training of physicians in the plants. That's the first step.

The second thing is, there must be developed a recognition of responsibility to the workers—the patients of that doctor and of that nurse. They are not the patients of the company. In other words, the professional relationship must exist between the doctor and the nurse, and the worker, just as it is in private practice.

BRAZDA. What about in a very small plant, in a small town, which may have no doctor? What do the workers do under those conditions?

MANCUSO. Well, he's really in a very, very difficult spot—he's worse off than anybody—because he has to go to his general practioner, his private physician, who, in turn, may not know anything at all about industrial diseases.

Doctors have never been trained in the concept of industrial diseases; doctors have been trained in the concept of infectious diseases—micro-biological concept of disease, the concept that bacteria and viruses cause disease, and the short latent period—the short incubation period—in which a disease can develop.

But this contrasts with chemicals—chemicals may cause death within minutes, too, but usually, they take a long period of time. Doctors are not trained in this.

What we need, really, is an organized effort by the medical societies, and all of the medical profession, and the medical schools, and the government, to develop an on-going program of in-service training for the physicians in practice, so that they will be able to identify the hazards.

We are trying, in this book—this "Help for the Working Wounded"—to actually bring the work environment to the doctor. We are trying to train the worker to recognize what factors and what information he must bring to the doctor, so that he brings his work environment to his doctor—so the doctor can make a better judgment and evaluation of his illness.

DAGLER. Mr. Samuels, Dr. Mancuso has talked about the problems of toxic substances and chemicals. Isn't legislation now pending in Congress to provide some kind of pre-market testing for toxic chemicals?

SAMUELS. For five years the labor movement has been a primary supporter of a pre-market testing bill—the Toxic Substances Bill—which is before the Congress at this time.

But that segment of society that expects workers to die for the right to work has been very successfully opposing passage of that bill.

I'd like to add one comment to what Dr. Mancuso was talking about.

It is true that we need exactly the kinds of tools that Dr. Mancuso is talking about, in terms of listing and describing the exposures of workers. When Dr. Mancuso talks about a family physician making a diagnosis based on a physical examination and some knowledge of what the worker is exposed to, this assumes that the worker has the right to have this information.

The fact is, the right to know what the

worker is exposed to, in the law, is embodied in the standard. And as you know, Sandy, there have been only three new standards promulgated in the five years that the Act has been in effect.

That means for hundreds—perhaps thousands of chemicals—no information of consequence is available to the worker.

It also means that the medical records the family physician needs—that the company may generate—these, also, are not available to the worker and to his physician.

BRAZDA. Dr. Mancuso, it sounds like a fine book—it is a fine book—I've looked at it—and it could be very helpful. How does an interested person go about obtaining it?

MANCUSO. Copies of "Help for the Working Wounded" can be ordered from the IAM Public Relations Department, 909 Machinists Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

The single copy cost is $1.00, which only covers the cost of printing and handling. For bulk orders, $75 for 100 copies.

BRAZDA. Will there be regular distribution throughout the labor movement?

MANCUSO. Yes, this will be distributed to all of the international unions throughout the United States, and to all of the local unions of the International Association of Machinists.

We're hopeful, also, that every worker will take a copy of "Help for the Working Wounded" to his doctor—company doctor, family doctor.

HARDEN. Thank you. Today's Labor News Conference guests were Sheldon Samuels, director of health, safety and environment for the AFL–CIO Industrial Union Department, and Dr. Thomas F. Mancuso, medical consultant to the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, AFL–CIO. Representing the press were James Brazda of Washington Report on Medicine and Health and Sandra Dagler of Occupational Safety and Health Report. This is Frank Harden, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL–CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Broadcasting System.

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The preceding program time was presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System. The opinions expressed are solely those of the participants.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN PHIL CRANE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, over the last decade we have seen Federal outlays for education about double, while the accompanying maze of Federal rules and regulations seems to have increased by geometric proportion. Federal money represents only about 7 percent of the total spent on education, yet the amount of control exerted by Government bureaucrats is far greater than this figure would indicate.

Recent controversies over busing and textbooks are merely symptoms of a growing concern over control of the decisionmaking processes in education. We need to reverse the flow of power to Washington and restore it to those best able to make decisions regarding the education of our children—those at the State and local levels.

With regard to this issue, I call to your attention an address delivered by our colleague, Congressman PHIL CRANE, at the first annual educators conference at Hoffman Estates, Ill., on July 24. As a former educator and school administrator, he is well qualified to speak on the subject of the Federal role in education, and I commend his remarks to you:

CONGRESSMAN CRANE'S REMARKS, FIRST ANNUAL EDUCATORS CONFERENCE, HOFFMAN ESTATES, ILL., JULY 24, 1976

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here in Hoffman Estates today, and I want to express my thanks to all those who have helped make this conference possible. A special debt of gratitude is due the representatives of the office of education and the Federal Mediation Service for joining us today and to those of you working with education here in Cook and Lake Counties for taking part of your weekend to meet with them. Hopefully, the effort will be beneficial to all concerned, ultimately rebounding to the benefit of those who have the most at stake—the children attending area schools.

In a way, being here also represents a homecoming of sorts for me. While it seems like only yesterday, I am reminded that I was in this very auditorium three years ago, again with Bob Creek, to help dedicate this school. One can only hope that what is being inaugurated today will fare as well as Hoffman Estates High School has since it inauguration.

However, I would be kidding myself, and deceiving you, if I did not point out that there is a fundamental difference between the two events. In a very real sense they are symbolic of the old and the new in American education. On the one hand, a high school dedication represents a fulfillment of the traditional American concept of public education locally controlled. On the other hand, the need for an education conference with Federal, State and local officials points up the relatively new but rapidly growing role of the Federal Government in our Educational process. Quite Frankly, while I heartily approve of dialogue to help in the transition process, I question the wisdom of the transition in the first place. History has shown that the people closest to a given situation know how to solve it best and education is no exception to that general rule. In fact, the academic achievements of our people, educated as most of us were in locally controlled public school systems, speak eloquently in support of that rule.

Be that as it may, the increasing Federal role in the field of education is a fact of life. On the heels of Federal money has come a welter of rules and regulations, some confusing, some annoying, and many contrary to the desires of a vast majority of Americans. The question becomes not just a matter of how to reverse the trend, but how to maintain quality education in the meantime. Unfortunately, it appears neither will be easy.

Ironically, the amount of Federal control over education far exceeds the amount of Federal aid to it. Recent estimates indicate that, on average only 7 percent of the money spent on education comes from the Federal Government and, in this school district, (school district 211), I am told that the percentage is far smaller than that. Making matters even worse, many States, including Illinois, pay in far more in taxes for education than they ever get back in aid to education. In fiscal 1974, for instance, Illnoisans paid approximately $20 billion in Federal taxes, approximately $440 million of which should have gone for education based on the fact that 2.2 percent of the budget for that year went to education. However, when the final figures were in, it turned out that Illinois got back only $227 million in moneys that could be used for education—or 52 cents on the dollar. In short, Federal aid is not the gift that some people think it is even if one discounts the busing, the affirmative action programs, the title IX requirements, and the paperwork that so often accompanies it. Sons and daughters of Illinois taxpayers are thus cheated out of the precious education dollars that are rightfully theirs, and harassed on top of it.

However many dark clouds there may be, and as a former teacher and school administrator I know there are many, I am not persuaded that this is an irreversible situation. Discontent over increasing Federal control coupled with concern over a decline in educational standards that has taken place in many areas of the country has prompted the administration to propose, for the third time in the last three Congresses, legislation that would continue Federal aid while reducing Federal strings. While far from perfect, the very existence of such legislation is an encouraging sign. It is an acknowledgement—from at least one quarter in Washington—that the people at home know more about their problems than do the elitist minded meddlers on the banks of the Potomac.

At present, Federal aid to education is dispensed through more than 100 categorical grant programs. As most of you are only too aware, applying for money under these programs not only involves compliance with requirements reflecting national norms rather than local circumstances but requires a tremendous amount of time-consuming paper work. What the administration proposal would do would be to consolidate 24 of these categorical grant programs into a single block grant proposal providing $3.3 billion in fiscal 1977 and increasing by an increment of $200 million for each of the three years following. While this would not end the "ripoff" of taking two education tax dollars out of Illinois for every one we get back, still no State would lose money under this proposal and Illinois would be the biggest gainer dollar wise. A recent Library of Congress study indicates that Illinois would get almost $3.5 million more under this plan in fiscal 1977 than it did under the existing system in fiscal 1976.

There are arguments for and against this approach, arguments that underscore the differences betwen the bloc grant and the categorical grant programs. Without doubt, consolidation of categorical grants into bloc grants would save money. Inasmuch as the latter are akin to revenue sharing programs, administrative costs would be far less for the Federal Government. As HEW Secretary David Mathews pointed out not too long ago, it costs about one-half of 1 percent to administer Federal revenue sharing but usually above 10 percent to run these categorical grant programs. Moreover, allowing States to decide how the money will be spent could mean greater flexibility in the implementation of education programs.

On the other hand, switching from categorical grants to bloc grants only gives greater flexibility as to how the money will be spent, not more local control over whether the programs in question are going to be adopted in the first place, how much money will be raised, or how much of it will be needed. Furthermore, this particular proposal has enough Federal Guidelines in it that it is questionable (1) how much additional flexibility in decision making will be achieved and (2) if the administrative savings to the Federal Government will not be offset by added administrative costs to the State governments. Unless some of these guidelines and strings are removed, perhaps the most that could be said for this proposal is that from the standpoint of local school sys-

tems, it would mean one less master to answer to in some instances.

At present, the administration proposal is in the House Education and Labor Committee, two days of hearings have been held on it, but at this point there seems little prospect that anything further will happen on it until next year. I should also point out that, while this proposal strongly resembles the education revenue sharing proposals introduced in the 92d and 93d Congress, it has some differences. For one thing, it consolidates fewer categorical grant programs; for another, it does not get into this business of impact aid as the 1973 proposals (known as the Better Schools Act) did.

Before leaving the subject of categorical grants, bloc grants and revenue sharing, I should additionally note that the general revenue sharing bill, which passed the House June 10 and is now pending in the Senate, dropped the existing prohibition against local governments using their share of general revenue sharing moneys for education. While the lack of accountability inherent in revenue sharing concerns me, as does the fact that there are no surplus revenues to share—only deficits—I do feel this is a step in the right direction. If a local government wants to spend its revenue sharing money on schools it ought to be able to.

Shortly after the House acted on general revenue sharing, the Supreme Court handed down a decision that should not only affect the future of that legislation but also the drive toward collective bargaining rights for public employees—such as teachers. By ruling, as the court did in National League of Cities v. Usery, that the Federal Government could not dictate wages and working conditions for employees of state and local governments. The court seems to be suggesting that the Federal Government could not apply the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, which provides for collective bargaining (among other things) to State and local employees. If so, and the fact that these points were raised during consideration of the case would suggest it is so, then the danger that the Congress would pass bills like H.R. 77 or H.R. 1488 is certainly reduced. Of course, State law may still be changed to provide for collective bargaining for its own employees, but it is less likely than ever that H.R. 77 or H.R. 1488 will come out of committee in the near future.

On another matter that I know is of concern to you, particularly to those of you in school districts facing a reduction in personnel due to declining enrollments, the House passed without my support an unemployment compensation revision bill just last Tuesday. Under terms of the bill, which now goes to the Senate, unemployment compensation coverage would be extended to approximately 7.7 million local government employees. About the only redeeming feature of this is that the bill at least prohibits the payment of unemployment compensation benefits to permanently employed teachers during times when school is not in session and it allows states to deny benefits to nonprofessional school employee during those periods.

Obviously, if this bill is enacted it will cost local governments millions of dollars. In introducing an amendment to remove coverage employees of State and local governments from the bill, my good friend and colleague Bill Ketchum estimated that cost at $1.2 to $2 billion a year and noted that many local governments would not be able to afford this cost. Unfortunately, the Ketchum amendment was defeated (212 to 186) but, it still seems to me that whether or not public employees are covered by unemployment compensation should, on both practical and constitutional grounds, be a matter for the local governments themselves to decide.

Significantly, the Supreme Court decision I mentioned a few moments ago, National League of Cities v. Usery, tends to support that view. Although the argument is not as strong as it is in the instance of applying collective bargaining provisions to employees of State and local governments, it can be argued that it is just as much a violation of States rights to dictate to State and local governments the type of fringe benefits they must pay their people as it is for the Federal Government to dictate wage scales and working conditions for State and local employees. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if there weren't a test case on this some where down the line.

Moving on to some other legislative items that I know are of interest to you, both the vocational education and the higher education authorization bill have passed the House and are pending in the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate. The former calls for $780.2 million for vocational education and $100 million for the National Institute for Education for fiscal 1977. In the case of higher education bill, it provides for $7.14 billion in funds for fiscal 1977, over $1 billion of which will go for basic educational opportunity grants.

About the only other education bill likely to be acted upon anytime soon by the House is the guaranteed student loan bill. However, with the job market today putting more and more emphasis on vocational and technical skills rather than on a college degree, one must wonder whether these loans are all that necessary or if, indeed, we aren't encouraging too many people to go on to college. I need hardly remind you that a good carpenter, plumber or auto mechanic makes far more than a Ph.D. in most universities—or most college graduates for that matter.

Before closing, I would like to mention one other legislative proposal that is in the works on a subject of keen interest to many of you—impact aid of all Federal aid to education programs. I have long felt that impact aid was the most justified. It is hardly fair to expect a local subdivision having a military base within its jurisdiction to educate the children of personnel living on the base when it cannot levy property taxes to compensate. The local government loses two ways; there are more children to educate and a smaller tax base to draw from. Certainly, the citizens of the community should not have to absorb that loss when it is not of their own making.

Less conclusive, however, is the argument that school districts should be compensated for category B children, those whose parents work at a Federal installation but live in the community and therefore pay property taxes to it. At present, the school districts get 40 to 50 percent of the cost of those pupils reimbursed by the Federal Government. But, to my way of thinking, a better way of handling this impact aid business might be to base reimbursements on the assessed value of the Federal property rather than on the number of children attending local schools. Congressman Ketchum will be introducing a bill along those lines in the next week or two and I want to look at it carefully. On the surface, it would seem that such a solution would not only be simpler, but would be fairer and less controversial. However, I would like your opinions on this before I proceed as I know that impact aid is extremely important to a number of school boards in this area.

The aforementioned impact aid proposal also highlights the fact that impact aid is a tax matter more than an education matter. At the root of the problem is the loss of tax revenue to local communities so, at the very least, I think impact aid should be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee on which I serve. An effort has already been made along these lines and I plan to make another one shortly.

One could go on almost indefinitely about Federal aid to education programs so numerous have they become but, instead, I thought I would close with a quote by Justice Louis Brandeis who once said "experience should teach us to be most on guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurks in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding."

BORN FREE

HON. JAMES P. (JIM) JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 4, 1976, I attended church services at the First United Presbyterian Church at Fort Collins, Colo. I was fortunate enough, on that great day of celebration for our Nation, to have the opportunity to hear the sermon of the Reverend James William Baird, an outstanding religious leader and a close friend. During services, I was very moved by Dr. Baird's words and found them highly appropriate for this most important time in our Nation's history. I wish my colleagues to have the opportunity of reading the very special thoughts Dr. Baird brought to us on our Bicentennial, and the text of his sermon, based on Acts 22: 27–28, follows:

BORN FREE

(By Dr. James William Baird)

"Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea.

"And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born."

May I change just one word in two verses of our scripture? I think this change will bring it right down to the moment. I want to change Roman to American. " 'Is it lawful for you to scourge a man who is an American, and uncondemned?' When the centurion heard that, he went and told the chief captain, saying 'Take heed what thou doest, for this man is an American.' The captain came and said to him, 'Art thou really an American?' And he said, 'Yes.' The captain said, 'With a great sum of money obtained I this citizenship.' But Paul said, 'I was born a citizen.' "

"I Was born free." With what pride Paul made that statement. What a tremendous thing it was to be a citizen of the Roman Empire. Many advantages, many privileges went with citizenship in that empire. Most of the people in the empire were slaves, serving the citizens of Rome. But a citizen could not be a slave. There were many who, like the Roman centurion, had purchased citizenship with great sums of money in order to enjoy the privileges and benefits of that citizenship. It was a very rare and wonderful thing when one could say, as Paul did that day, "I was born a citizen of Rome." And so he was. Born and reared in the city of Tarsus. Son of a freed man. His father was a merchant in the city of Tarsus, a man of affairs. Paul had grown up without ever knowing the day that he was not a citizen of Rome. "I was born a citizen," Paul said.

One has but to travel abroad to sense something of the pride with which Paul made that statement. I think it is a high moment when an American overseas comes

to the border gates of one nation, preparing to cross into another, and holds up his passport, which says, "I am an American citizen." Immediately gates are opened, doors are unlocked, opportunities are extended and courtesies offered. The traveler abroad realizes that it is a high and holy privilege to be an American citizen.

There are, however, certain hazards in this business of being born free, of having received this inheritance of citizenship by virtue of the place of one's birth. That hazard is that we take it for granted, that we assume that all men around the world are as free as we are. We tend to think that freedom is something automatic rather than something which must be fed, nurtured and protected. We who were born free assume that freedom is our right rather than a gift which has been purchased for us at great sacrifice. To understand this, one has but to talk to people in various parts of the world and hear the longing in their voice as they speak of the rights which you and I inherited and experience each day of our lives. The great hazard is that we shall become indifferent to the rarity of our freedom and of our citizenship.

We Americans need to rediscover that the roots of this freedom which we enjoy lie not just in a declaration of independence on the part of thirteen colonies, but in what lies behind that declaration: the longing and the hope of multitudes in England and Scotland, and on the continent of Europe, enslaved by tradition and culture and custom. We need to remember that ours was a bold experiment and to realize again that behind that experiment was the spiritual revolution of the Protestant Reformation which spilled out across Europe and the Atlantic, into the colonies, and planted a dream of freedom in terms of certain God-given, inalienable rights.

One needs to remember that America's freedom emerged from such things as the spiritual and intellectual renaissance of western Europe. To appreciate the freedom that we have, one needs to stand in an ancient cemetery of Europe or Great Britain, and read the inscriptions on the tombstones much of the lettering almost washed away by time—the names and the message of the martyrs who died for the day when such a nation as ours might be born. Those who died for religious freedom. Those who died for human dignity. On one tombstone in the city of Edinburgh there is a mass grave on whose stone is written these words: "Beneath this stone lie the bodies of some of the 18,000 people who died in Edinburgh rather than give up their faith in Jesus Christ."

We need to hear again the words of warning to the Western world that have come to us from Alexander Solzhenitsyn, when not many months ago he said to the people of Great Britain: "How is it that people who have been crushed by sheer weight of slavery and cast to the bottom of the pit, can, nevertheless, find strength in themselves to rise up and free themselves; first in spirit and then in body; while those who soar unhampered over the peaks of freedom, suddenly lose the taste of freedom, lose the will to defend it, and, hopelessly confused and lost, almost begin to crave slavery?"

We need to remember the words of Jesus Christ: If you continue in my Word, then are you my disciples; and you shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free."

To be free is much more than merely to be rid of restraint. True freedom is the opportunity to choose that upon which one wills to be dependent. Freedom is actually the opportunity to choose one's restraint. Fragile man cannot stand alone by virtue of his own strength and ability. He needs something that is larger than himself, that is higher than himself, upon which he may lean, to which he may cling. Thus, freedom becomes our right to choose that upon which we shall lean and to which we shall cling. And it is the right to change our minds if we so choose.

Walter Lippman has written, "We are free if we have the faculty of knowing what we ought to do, and then have the will to do it." Freedom lies not necessarily in each man's doing his own thing in isolation. It is rather in the recognition that together we need to seek that which is the highest and best upon which to rest our lies, our future and our hope. The poet has expressed it beautifully when he wrote: Make me a captive, Lord, and then I shall be free. Force me to render up my sword, And I shall conqueror be.

Thus, freedom is the recognition that ultimately God is in control. The framers of our Declaration of Independence and Constitution recognized that at the heart of human freedom lies the reality of the truth of God, Who alone sets men free when they surrender themselves and their destiny into His hands.

Abraham Lincoln, in the time of the Civil War, said one day to his newspaper friend, Noah Brooks: "I've been driven many times upon my knees from the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go."

Thus, freedom carries no compass of its own. Its only north star is Truth. As Jesus said, "I am the way the truth and the life. You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Herein therefore lies our freedom: in the quality of our faith; in the dedication of our lives to the pursuit of truth, behind which is the reality of God. Only when we, as a people, by virtue of our lives, continues to seek that truth that He reveals, shall we continue to be free.

To freedom there is another side which we must note this morning. That is its price. Freedom is the floor of morality and of discipline. We need to remember that this freedom which you and I enjoy has been purchased at a fantastic price. I wish every American could stand in the American National Cemetery in Northern Italy, as I have done. There the hillsides and the quiet valley are literally filled with thousands upon thousands of the white markers that declare the last resting place of American men and women who died in the cause of freedom.

This is not an isolated situation. Here and there across the surface of this globe, similar holy shrines exist. We are reminded again that freedom survives only to the extent that there are those who continue to believe that there are values worth dying for. The spiritual qualities of the human heart are the dynamics of human freedom.

Freedom is the crisis of faith. It is not legislated. It is not dictated. It cannot be bought or sold. It is in that area of what people believe. It is rooted in that concept of human faith in the highest and the best. Thus freedom is not discarded inhibitions. It is the crisis of faith. Democracy is a political organization based on faith. Faith in God and in one another. Faith in the ultimate worth of all human beings. Faith in the moral low. Faith in the possibilities of redemption and the power of love. Faith in the belief that righteousness overcomes evil.

During these past few weeks, I have stood in the midst of the ruins of greatness—of castles and of government halls, of places of ancient justice—realizing again how futile is the greatness of man as it is spelled out in things material. But the faith and the honor of mankind live on in the flower of nations such as our own, and of persons who continue to uphold that faith in the quality of their lives. Freedom is indeed the crisis of human faith.

As we celebrate our nation's birthday today, we recognize again that the ultimate freedom for which, by which and within this nation was founded is that which God alone can give, through Jesus Christ. It is Citizenship in an everlasting Kingdom of God. Herein lies our final commitment.

Perhaps the ultimate in freedom is illustrated in the fact that I, the descendant of simple Scots who were unlearned and poverty-stricken, could return and stand in the ruins of ancient greatness, in judgment upon the sins of those who ruled over them. It is a freedom purchased by the longing and the sacrifice of human heart, rooted in the bloodstream by the spirit of God as He calls men to fulfill His purpose.

Thus our nation was given its birth. Though in many, many ways she has not fulfilled her dream, she continues to believe in it and to struggle on to its final fulfillment. Changing the human heart and human society are not separate tasks. They are as interconnecting as the beams of the cross. Jesus was a revolutionary who offered no ideology. He offered Himself. And in Him we are set free, first, from sin and death; and second, from the chains of man's inhumanity to man. We stand with Paul, and say with pride, "I was born free."

REVIEW OF AVIATION LEGISLATION ACTIONS 1975–76

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, although we have a number of weeks remaining in the current session of the Congress, with the onrush of closing activity closer at hand than we might realize, we are at time for assessment of the actions which have been taken as well as those not taken in this Congress.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve on the Aviation Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee. Our subcommittee has enjoyed a busy and productive schedule, dealing with a variety of matters of significance not only to those involved in aviation but to the Nation as a whole.

It is not possible to touch on every single item which our subcommittee considered, but I would like to take this time to provide a brief review of our activities.

This report, I should note, has been developed through the capable cooperation of the subcommittee staff which has demonstrated its responsibility and dedication to the advancement of aviation as an integral part of our progress and development as a Nation.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1976, H.R. 9771, PUBLIC LAW 94–353

The Congress completed action on H.R. 9771 June 30, 1976, and the bill was signed into law July 12. Legislation modifies and extends (fiscal years 1976 through 1980) authorizations for several programs administered by Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and funded from Airport and Airway Trust Fund, including following:

Airport Development Air Program (ADAP): Authorizes Federal grants for airport development upon application by local communities. About 86 percent of program is for air carrier airport development; about 14 percent for general aviation airport development. Distribution of air carrier portion based on enplanement formula; distribution of general aviation portion based on relative State area/population ratio. $15 million set aside for commuter service airports; $15 million set aside for reliever airports. Total of $2.735 billion authorized for ADAP during five-year period.

Facilities and Equipment (F&E): Authorizes expenditures for capital costs of acquiring airway system facilities and equipment. Total of $1.250 billion authorized for F&E during five-year period.

Maintenance of Airway Facilities: Authorizes expenditures for certain costs of maintaining airway system facilities and equipment. Total of $1.150 billion authorized for Maintenance during five-year period.

Public Law 94–353 places greater emphasis on development of smaller air carrier airports, as well as commuter service and reliever airports; mandates improved National Airport System Plan, limited terminal development at air carrier airports, and increased State role in general aviation airport development.

EMERGENCY LOCATOR TRANSMITTERS—ELT'S—H.R. 8228

House passed H.R. 8228 February 17, 1976, but Senate has not yet acted. Bill would retain statutory requirement for ELT's and categories of aircraft exempted, but requires FAA to issue regulations to permit operation of ELT-equipped aircraft when ELT has been removed for inspection, repair, modification, or replacement. H.R. 8228 is intended to provide needed flexibility in such circumstances without derogating safety.

WAR RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM

(1) H.R. 8564 (Public Law 94–90): Congress completed action on H.R. 8564 July 31, 1975, and bill signed into law by President August 9, 1975. Legislation extended War Risk Insurance Program, in effect since 1951, until May 1976. Under program, FAA insures civil aircraft against war risks when (a) President determines commercial operations into war zones are necessary and (d) commercial coverage is not available. Public Law 94–90 also mandated Administration study to determine if program should be expanded to include coverage for other risks, such as highjacking, riots, and vandalism not arising out of war situation. Administration report recommends authorization be granted to provide such additional coverage.

(2) H.R. 13308: Congress completed action on H.R. 13308 July 20, 1976, and bill now awaiting action by President. Legislation would extend War Risk Insurance Program as is for one year to provide time to study Administration recommendations for extending coverage to other risks.

PUBLIC NOTICE OF AIR FARE CHANGES, H.R. 7017

House passed H.R. 7017 February 17, 1976, but Senate has not yet acted. Bill would require Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) to decide no later than 15 days prior to effective date whether to allow proposed passenger fare and freight rate changes to go into effect. Thus, public would receive 15 days notice of CAB denial of such proposed changes. At present, CAB decision may be made any time prior to effective date—thereby precluding advance notice of denials.

RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF SIX AIRPORTS

On March 11, 1976, Congress completed action on six bills[1] to authorize release of certain Federal restrictions on use of six public airports formerly owned by Federal government, and all six bills were signed into law by President on or before March 24, 1976. All six airports were conveyed to respective local jurisdictions under Federal Airport Act which precluded use of properties for other than airport purposes. All six bills authorize release of restrictions to permit affected jurisdictions to sell or lease portions not needed for airport purposes for industrial and other compatible uses at fair market value.

[1] H.R. 1313 Rolla, Missouri; H.R. 2575 Algona, Iowa; S. 270 (H.R. 2740) Elkhart, Kansas; H.R. 3440 Grand Junction, Colorado; H.R. 8508 Camden, Arkansas; and H.R. 9617 Alva, Oklahoma.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD AUTHORIZATION, H.R. 12118

House passed H.R. 12118 on May 17, 1976; Senate Commerce Committee reported similar bill, S. 2661, on May 14, 1976, but full Senate has not yet acted. Primary function of National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), an independent agency, is to investigate major transportation accidents, notably aviation accidents, and to recommend improved safety measures on basis of findings. H.R. 12118 would establish NTSB funding authorization levels at $3.8 million for the transition quarter ending September 30, 1976, $15.2 million for fiscal year 1977, and $16.4 million for fiscal year 1978. Heretofore, major activity of NTSB has been investigation of aircraft accidents, but H.R. 12118 mandates greater emphasis on investigation of highway accidents.

AVIATION HEARINGS, 1975–76

AIRLINE DEREGULATION, H.R. 10261

Aviation Subcommittee conducted lengthy hearings on Administration proposal (H.R. 10261) to reduce Federal role in regulation of airline routes and fares. Administration testified increased competition would strengthen industry, improve service, and reduce fares; airlines view proposal as disruptive and likely to damage air transportation system. Aviation Subcommittee may act on airline deregulation legislation during 94th Congress, but any bill reported expected to be far less comprehensive than H.R. 10261.

AIRCRAFT NOISE

Aviation Subcommittee thoroughly examined Federal role in reducing aircraft noise, technical feasibility of reducing aircraft source noise, and means of achieving meaningful aircraft noise level reductions within foreseeable future. Airlines opposed retrofit of existing aircraft as excessively costly and ineffective, but other witnesses urged prompt adoption of remedial measures to alleviate problem. Numerous bills to require action pending. Administration recommendations for retrofit/replacement program awaited. Not yet determined whether Aviation Subcommittee will proceed with legislation during 94th Congress.

AIRLINE MUTUAL AID PACT

Mutual Aid Pact is agreement among several large and small airlines under which struck carriers receive payments from participating carriers to compensate for lost revenue during strikes. Airlines testified agreement is strike insurance; opponents view agreement as unfair bargaining tool. Several bills to abolish or modify agreement pending. Not yet determined whether Aviation Subcommittee will proceed with legislation during 94th Congress.

INTERLINE SERVICE FOR INTRASTATE AIRLINES, H.R. 10560

At present, intrastate airlines (serving points within single States) are not permitted to provide through ticketing, connecting, and baggage service for interstate passengers aboard interstate airlines. H.R. 10560 would enable intrastate airlines to provide such services through Federal certification, and they testified bill would benefit public; interstate airlines stated proposal would permit unfair competition. Not yet determined whether Aviation Subcommittee will proceed with legislation during 94th Congress.

AIRLINE ECONOMICS

Investigations and Review Subcommittee and Aviation Subcommittee conducted joint hearings to receive testimony from presidents of most major airlines on current economic problems confronting industry. Witnesses focused on inadequate fare levels and rising costs—notably 300 percent fuel price increase since 1974. They cited resultant inability of industry to generate profits—thereby precluding purchase of new aircraft within foreseeable future to improve operational efficiency and reduce aircraft noise. No legislation expected to result.

REPORT OF SPECIAL AIR SAFETY ADVISORY GROUP—SASAG

At request of FAA, SASAG, a group of six retired airline captains, prepared report citing various aviation safety problems—notably in air traffic control. Testimony by SASAG group expanded on contents of report. FAA officials provided FAA views—some positive; others negative—on SASAG recommendations. No legislation expected to result, but Aviation Subcommittee intends to monitor problems SASAG group identified.

VIKING MISSION—A SEARCH FOR LIFE

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. ROUSH. The Viking mission to Mars is not only man's first serious search for the existence of extraterrestrial life, but is a search to retrace our beginning and to predict our destiny.

Viking I was launched approximately 1 year ago and has traveled over 400 million miles to rendezvous with Mars at a current distance of 220 million miles from Earth. It seems such a brief moment ago that we were watching astronaut Neil Armstrong make the first human imprint of a planet when he stepped on the Moon surface on July 20, 1969. It is difficult to imagine that the distance to Mars is 900 times the distance between the Moon and the Earth. This distance is so great that it requires 19 minutes for a light or radio wave, which is the fastest motion known, to be transmitted between the two planets. The quality of the photographs we are receiving and the sophistication of the experiments being conducted on the Martian surface have required the dedication of thousands of our most prominent technicians and scientists. We salute these Americans and share their anticipation toward the receipt and analysis of data which has been specifically designed to search for traces of life on Mars. Within the scientific community, there is a great deal of excitement and controversy over the possibility of life in our galaxy. Cornell University astronomy professors Carl Sagan and Frank Drake stated in the May 1975 issue of Scientific American:

> Our best guess is that there are a million civilizations in our galaxy at or beyond the earth's present level of technological development. If they are distributed randomly through space, the distance between us and the nearest civilization should be about 300 light years. Hence any information conveyed between the nearest civilization and our own will take a minimum of 300 years for a one-way trip and 600 years for a question and response.

Dr. Sagan, who appeared in July of 1968 before a special symposium I chaired on unidentified flying objects for the House Science Astronautics Committee—now the Science and Technology Committee—is one of the few scientists who anticipates seeing macrobes on Mars. Macrobes are forms of life that are visible to the unaided eye.

The search for life is the most exciting adventure ever undertaken by man. Even if we do not find a trace of life during this mission, the scientific and technological experience we have gained is immeasurable. The questions we could ask, and should ask, are limited only by our own imagination. The expansion of the American frontier, indeed of man's frontier, has just begun. I am thrilled that I have been a part of this great adventure since 1959 as I was a charter member of the House Science Astronautics Committee, and after an involuntary 2-year sabbatical, I now serve on the House Appropriations Committee which oversees funding for our space program. The American Bicentennial finds us celebrating not only the prodigious accomplishments we have achieved in our brief 200-year history, but finds us marveling at the American genius which has placed our country as the world's leader in the search for life.

Viking II will be landing on Mars later this month and will join Viking I in gathering data. Whatever the biological results of this mission, we have learned one important lesson—we have the expertise to continue to search the heavens for the answer to the most basic questions man has asked himself since life began on our planet—where is my past, and where lies my future? The answers to these questions may be only an incredibly brief space trip away.

REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime, impartial observer of the national political scene, I am somewhat dismayed by the lack of attention being accorded to a slowly but steadily escalating saga which would add a fascinating chapter to our political history.

In the past, I have had little difficulty in recognizing the value of priorities involved in gathering and disseminating the news. Now, however, I am somewhat puzzled by the news media's dilemma in trying, on an almost around-the-clock basis, to unravel and interpret the pre-convention vote strength of the two reputed principal contenders for the Republican Presidential nomination.

Evidently, the news media knows there is nationwide interest in whether the convention delegate from West Worthington Falls is tilting to President Ford or Ronald Reagan. For me, it conjures up memories of the old Abbott and Costello routine of "Who's on First."

In moving delegates into and out of the Ford and Reagan columns, the news media still must tell us what effect Senator RICHARD SCHWEIKER will have on Reagan's chances for the nomination. Who will Ford tap to be his running mate? In alphabetical order it could be Ambassador Anne Armstrong, Senator HOWARD BAKER, John Connally, Nelson Rockefeller, or some political unknown.

In its scrambling to keep us posted on these monumental developments, I think the news media may be missing a genuinely significant happening. The carefully scripted scenario for that event reads like this:

With Ford and Reagan on the edge of exhaustion in their titanic struggle for the Presidential nomination, there will be no first-ballot decision at Kansas City. A deadlock will ensue, but when the smoke clears, there, standing in the convention spotlight, will be Harold E. Stassen. He knows he is a winner because the people immediately recognize his experience in both domestic and foreign policy and that he has been right on the great issues confronting our Nation. I know this is fact because Stassen told me so in a recent letter explaining how he could unite our party and the majority of the American people.

With Stassen as the Republican standardbearer, the list of issues for reportorial exploitation almost boggles the mind. How, for instance, could Jimmy Carter be considered the only bona fide "mystery candidate" if forced to compete with a man who would be making the quantum jump from a footnote in history to center stage? Then there are the public pollsters. They would have to take new public opinion samples, and personnel in foreign embassies would have to work overtime in researching and explaining Stassen's 1948 speeches to their respective governments.

As you can see, Stassen's candidacy has all the ingredients for the "big" political news story of 1976. Be that as it may, I must acknowledge I am still vigorously supporting President Ford.

Now, let me see. The last count I had was.

The letter follows:

HAROLD E. STASSEN,
Philadelphia, Pa., July 19, 1976.

Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DERWINSKI: Now that all of the Republican delegates have been elected, and it appears that neither of the two campaigners have a majority of the delegates, may I respectfully write to you personally to invite your consideration; if you are uncommitteed, of a vote for me on the first ballot; and if you are committeed, of a vote for me on later ballots if your first ballot candidate does not succeed.

I am confident that if the admitted near-miracle occurs and I am nominated, I can unite our Republican party and unite the majority of the American people in November for an election victory.

But more important, I am confident that I could lift and lead our country to full employment without inflation, and to reestablish American leadership in the United Nations and in the world for peace, with developing justice and expanding freedom.

Informal samples of opinion taken with the enclosed ballot indicate that fourteen percent of the voters, who are independents and democrats, would swing from Carter to me, and this makes the crucial difference for victory.

It appears that notwithstanding the lack of a campaign, and notwithstanding the humor and ridicule from some of the media, the people do recognize:

My extensive successful experience in both domestic and foreign policy;

The fact that I am and have been right on the great issues of our nation;

The unblemished record not only personally but also for the major administrations which I have conducted and have been responsible for, in peace and in war; and

The continuing commitment of fairness to all and favoritism to none.

The policies and programs which I would follow would be new and up-to-date and forward-looking; but they would all be based on sound, tried, and tested principles and broad experience. Some of my Minnesota friends will be sending you a copy of my address to the Minnesota Republican Convention in June 1976, which gives some concrete details.

May I add that I have not at any time personally attacked either President Ford or Governor Reagan, and I will not do so.

You may easily check on the sentiments of the independents and democrats in your community by making copies of the enclosed ballot and by having someone take an informal ballot box sample.

I will look forward to seeing you at Kansas City.

With personal best wishes, as ever,

Sincerely,

HAROLD E. STASSEN.

CUBA AND THE PANAMA CANAL

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government faces many problems with some of the major ones in the field of foreign policy. Because of the cloak of secrecy surrounding the operations of our foreign policymakers, it is often a difficult task for Members of Congress to inform the people of the United States as to what is actually transpiring.

A highly illuminating story about this aspect of American politics is a recent book by Gary Allen entitled "Kissinger: The Secret Side of the Secretary of State." Replete with facts, it is an exposé of the House of Rockefeller and the drive to bring about the merging of the United States into the so-called New World Order. As such, the book, published by the '76 Press, Post Office Box 2686, Seal Beach, Calif., 90740, should be read by every American, especially Members of the Congress.

Chapter 7 of the book entitled, "Betraying Freedom in Latin America" is most timely in presenting the two key problems of the Western Hemisphere: Cuba and the Panama Canal.

The indicated chapter follows as part of my remarks:

BETRAYING FREEDOM IN LATIN AMERICA

The Nixon campaign rhetoric in 1968 promised a hard line against Communist excursions in the Western Hemisphere. But as in so many cases in the Nixon Era, while the conservatives got the rhetoric, the Liberals got all of the action. When Rockefeller agent Henry Kissinger was installed as adviser on national security affairs, it became apparent that "holding firm" meant giving the Communists almost everything they wanted, just as quickly as public opinion would allow.

The Rockefeller-Kissinger team immediately began promoting a Latin American foreign policy which was the very antithesis of the policy Americans *thought* they were getting when they elected Richard Nixon. It consisted of two main reversals of earlier promises. The first was a growing recognition of the Communist conquest of Cuba. Accepting this fact was to be sold to the American people as hemispherically inevitable, necessary for peace, and besides, it made good business sense.

The second key part of the Kissinger policy was even more ticklish, and it ran into stiff opposition from the start. That was Henry the K's repeated efforts to surrender U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal. The giveaway of this strategic waterway was being sold to the public as vital to improve our poor relations with much of Latin America.

But most Americans were too mesmerized by the three-ring foreign-policy circus overseas—the "opening" to Red China, the "peace" in Vietnam, the incessant war in the Middle East—to pay too much attention to what was going on in nearby Latin America.

Soon after Nixon took office in 1969, conservative columnist Paul Scott reported that although "the President pledged to tighten the U.S. economic-political quarantine of Cuba if elected, Kissinger is working quietly within the Nixon Administration for just the opposite." It became known that Kissinger had asked the Rand Corporation to make a study on the feasibility of restoring political, economic, and cultural relations with Cuba. In fact, Henry the K had even asked the Rand Corporation to study the circumstances under which the anti-Communist government of Brazil might be overthrown.*

While all this was going on, any efforts with the Nixon Administration to move against Communism in this hemisphere—and there *were* anti-Communists around Nixon as well as within State and the CIA—were blocked by Kissinger.

The stage was set for U.S. trade with the Cuban tyranny and eventual U.S. recognition through one of Henry's usual tactics—secret U.S. maneuvering. The plan called for the Organization of American States to soften its stand against Cuba. Then the United States would reluctantly bow to "the will of the Americas" and grant recognition to the Castro regime. The whole affair was about as spontaneous as the Rose Parade.

The North American Newspaper Alliance reported in October 1974 that an agreement "in principle" for U.S. recognition of Cuba had already been reached and that "the current script calls for the United States to appear as if it were forced to acquiesce to the views of the other American states." NANA's Ernest Cuneo added: "In clinging to the ridiculous fiction that his State Department officials know nothing of the negotiations, Kissinger is morally lying to the American people—again."

By May 1975, *The Review of the News* could report that "through the covert efforts of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, governments of Latin American countries are being told that the U.S. looks with favor on the lifting of sanctions against Communist Cuba by the Organization of American States."

By June, Fidel Castro was so confident that the United States would restore diplomatic relations with Cuba that he predicted, in Madrid's *Arriba* magazine, that recognition would occur, that Latin American countries would grow stronger while the United States grew weaker, and that Cuba was not planning to budge one inch on its declared aim of seizing our Guantanamo Naval base. "Some day they will leave Guantanamo just as they left Vietnam in the war that cost them $150 billion," the bearded one gloated.

Another part of Kissinger's propaganda effort on behalf of Castro was granting permission for "friendly" U.S. congressmen to junket to Cuba. The most enraptured visitor was former presidential candidate George McGovern, the muddled Leftist who made Richard Nixon look so good by comparison in 1972. McGovern's trip to Cuba resulted in a saccharin outpouring of eulogies for Castro and demands for an end to our economic embargo. Kissinger, who arranged McGovern's private flight to Cuba from a U.S. airbase in Florida, got exactly what he wanted.

So in August 1975, the Organization of America States, meeting in Costa Rica, voted 16 to 3 with two abstentions to lift its sanctions against the Communist dictatorship ninety miles from our shores. The U.S. Ambassador to the OAS, Rockefeller man William S. Mailliard, did not make even a token resistance to this carefully staged repudiation of Washington's policy for the past eleven years.

Incredibly, the vote whitewashing Cuba did not set *any* conditions or make *any* demands of the Red dictatorship. The United States delegates did not even mention the 2,000 Americans still confined on the island, the $2 *billion* indebtedness to Americans for property confiscated by Cuban authorities, the thousands of political prisoners languishing in Cuban dungeons, the 33,000 Cubans slain by the Communists to establish a Soviet power base on the island. All this was to be forgiven, forgotten, and ignored.

While Kissinger is cuddling up to Cuba, the island has become virtually a Russian military outpost. There are at least 25,000 Russian soldiers operating military bases at Mariel, Nipe, Cienfuegos, Cayo Largo, Playa Giron, and the Isle of Pines. Some 8,000 Russian technicians run most of Cuba's vital industries. There are frequent Soviet spy flights and reconnaissance sailings from points within Cuba.

For the past seventeen years, Communist Cuba has also been exporting its revolution in every way that it can. Airplane hijackings, for example, increased some four-hundred percent in the late 1960s—just after a school for hijackers was organized on the island. The evidence is indisputable that Havana has become a key base for the smuggling of opium and other hard narcotics from Communist supply sources in the Far East into the United States and Latin America.

Fidel Castro has openly gloated, of course, that he expects to take over the U.S. Naval Base on Guantanamo—the multi-billion-dollar American outpost which is a vital link for American defense forces in the Western Hemisphere. Should Henry Kissinger present this gift-wrapped to the Communists (and in Washington there are rumors such a secret deal has already been made), the Communists would threaten *all* shipping through the Panama Canal.

While Fidel's effort to supply the leadership to Communist revolts in other Latin and South American countries may have faltered in recent years, the presence of Cuban troops in Africa more than makes up for any failures closer to home. Any conceivable *detente* with Cuba became even harder to swallow in late 1975 and 1976 as it became clear that the Soviet Union was using Cuba as its major base for the armed takeover of Angola, the former Portuguese territory on Africa's west coast. The 15,000 Cuban troops inside Angola may well have made the difference for the Soviet victory in the war there.

According to Paul Scott, thousands of Cuban troops, military advisers, and espionage agents, financed and directed by the Russians, are deployed in at least fifteen countries on three continents. In the meantime, Cuba's 150,000-man army remains the largest in the Western Hemisphere, other than our own.

As the Angola involvement developed day by day in late 1975 and early 1976, Kissinger *sounded* good. He talked tough about the Cubans sending soldiers to Africa, about the Soviet Union being in Africa, about the "extra-continental intervention" into Angolan affairs. But as expected, the Administration *did* nothing to thwart the Communists. In fact, since much of the $81 million in the U.S. grants, loans, and credits for neighboring Zaire, run by the Marxist "President for Life" Sese Seko Kuku Ngbendu Wa Za Banga, were funneled into Angola, it meant the United States was in the unique position of helping Red China fund one of the "anti-Soviet" factions in the weird Angola war.

So while Kissinger publicly warned Castro about Cuban intervention in Angola, at the same time Henry K told the U.S. representative to the Organization of American States to vote for dismantling the OAS special commission which had kept tabs on Communist activities in the Western Hemisphere. Kissinger was about as sincere as W. C. Fields offering to lead a temperance crusade against Demon Rum.

Why is Henry Kissinger so determined to have the United States embrace Communist Cuba? Part of the reason, no doubt, is the whole do-anything-to-please-the-Communists mentality which plays such an important part in *detente*. And there is ample evidence that the Soviets would like to see the American taxpayers underwrite the cost of the glorious socialist experiment on the island. Although Cuba had been one of the wealthiest nations in the Americas before the advent of Communism, presently it is a $1.5 million *per day* liability for Moscow. Much better that the burden be shifted to U.S. taxpayers.

In fact, the Union Defensora de la Democracia, an anti-Communist group in Mexico, reported in mid-1975 that the stage has already been set for the Rockefellers' Chase Manhattan Bank to loan Cuba all the money it needs to cut its $8-million-per-week umbilical cord with Moscow. The loans, of course, will never be repaid; the money will be loaned by the Rockefellers, but *guaranteed by the U.S. government*. When Castro defautls, the U.S. government will pay off the Rockefellers.*

The London *Sunday Telegraph* on August 31, 1975, however, provided an even more intriguing explanation for the Rockefeller-Kissinger embrace of Castro:

"This year's most surprising *détente*—the resumption of relations of a sort between President Ford's U.S.A. and Fidel Castro's Communist Cuba—owes a good deal more to hard heads than to soft hearts. The motive behind it can be summed up in one word—oil. . . . Recent seismological tests by the Russians in Cuban waters have apparently revealed the likelihood of several large oil structures which form the immensely rich Gulf of Mexico oil fields. But Castro knows

* This second study was not triggered by a great Kissinger concern over Brazil shifting to the Left. It seems that some Brazilian government officials had discussed the possibility of expropriating the holdings of International Petroleum Company, a subsidiary of the Rockefellers' Standard Oil of New Jersey.

* It would hardly be the first time that American taxpayers have rescued Rockefeller operations in other countries. A huge number of U.S. loans for "less developed countries" have a strange way of ending up in the pockets of the Rockefellers. Foreign aid programs, for example, apparently insure Rockefeller gaming lodges in Kenya, Rockefeller agricultural and marketing businesses in Iran, a Rockefeller ceramic tile and bath accessory plant in Korea, Rockefeller firms in the Dominican Republic, and House of Rockefeller enterprises in India, Guyana, Brazil, Pakistan, the Philippines, and dozens, perhaps scores, of other countries.

only too well that to develop such fields he will need American finance."

Kissinger's kiss-and-make-up approach to Communist Cuba (at U.S. taxpayer expense, of course) is bad enough for America. But actually his policies regarding Cuba seem like hard-nosed anti-Communism when compared to his incredible actions aimed at surrendering U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal.

If American sentiment and official Congressional action count for anything, the chances that the federal government will give away the Panama Canal are zero. On June 24, 1975, the House of Representatives voted 246 to 164 to prohibit any State Department funds from being used to negotiate the surrender of any U.S. rights in the Panama Canal Zone. Public surveys taken about the same time showed that five Americans out of six wanted the U.S. to retain ownership of the Canal. And a group of 38 Senators—four more than needed to block ratification of any giveaway treaty—was on record opposing any surrender of U.S. rights in the Canal Zone.

But popular sentiment and even Congressional action were not enough to thwart a Kissinger who had already chosen a different direction. Following the House vote, he sent the following message to General Omar Torrijos, the pro-Soviet dictator of Panama:

"I want you to know that in spite of these things, I am still engaged in the search for a final and just solution to this problem and the establishment of a new and more modern relationship between the two countries."

In other words, Henry the K was apologizing to Comrade Torrijos because the representatives of the American people refused to go along with Kissinger's surrender scheme!

Despite the propaganda line being developed to "legitimize" the surrender of our sovereignty over the Panama Canal, the facts are as follows:

The Panama Canal belongs to the United States. The Canal Zone was *sold* to this country on November 18, 1903, by the new Republic of Panama. The agrement gave the United States total and compelte ownership "in perpetuity." The treaty was ironclad—it stated that U.S. sovereignty would be "to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority."

Despite what some American negotiators, such as Ellsworth Bunker and William D. Rogers, have suggested, it seems absurd to think that the U.S. could be stampeded into signing away the Panama Canal because of sword-rattling by a tiny Latin American country. "If Panama does not recover the Canal Zone, no one can prevent the Panamanians from destroying, making inoperative, or paralyzing the canal," said one foreign policy adviser. Panama "has reached the limit of its patience" in negotiations with the U.S. for a new treaty, warned Dictator Torrijos in early 1975. The United States has 11,000 troops stationed along the Canal—twice the number of soldiers that Torrijos commands. But Bunker and Rogers act as if they were truly worried about what this tinhorn dictator might do.

Ellsworth Bunker, moreover, seems to have made a career out of surrendering gracefully to the Communists. He was the main negotiator of the team that turned over control of West New Guinea to Communist Achmed Sukarno in 1965, in exchange for a worthless promise of free elections. Bunker later was appointed U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, where he continually lectured American military officials on the need to exercise "the patience and restraint to fight a limited war with limited means for limited objectives." Ellsworth Bunker is, in short, a giveaway artist and a capitulation expert. He is just the kind of fellow Kissinger would select for negotiations on giving away the Panama Canal.

Incredibly enough, Bunker has claimed that giving the Panama Canal to the Communists will somehow be good for us. "In our negotiations we are atempting to lay the foundations for a new—a more modern—relationship which will enlist Panamanian cooperation and *better protect our interests,*" he has said. That groaning sound you hear is Teddy Roosevelt turning over in his grave.*

The United States does not "rent" the Canal Zone. This country paid for and has clear title to it. Giving away the clear title we have to the Panama Canal is exactly the same as giving Alaska back to Russia, returning the Louisiana Purchase to France, or surrendering Texas and California to Mexico and Spain.

It will not surprise you to learn that an early architect of the Panama giveaway scheme was a Rockefeller man, Robert B. Anderson of the CFR. He was President Johnson's chief negotiator in 1967, subsequently kept on by Richard Nixon. (The *first* U.S. official to propose that the Canal be internationalized was the very respected CFR man in the State Department, Alger Hiss!)

But it was that other, much better known Rockefeller agent, Henry Kissinger, who took up the cudgels from Anderson, Herr Henry signed a "statement of principles" with Dictator Torrijos in February 1974, promising that the U.S. would renounce sovereignty over the Canal and hand it over to Panama. When Nixon resigned and Ford assumed what used to be the highest office in the land, Kissinger was quick to inform Panama that "the change in the U.S. presidency will not affect the negotiations for a new Panama Canal treaty."

Perhaps alarmed by the growing opposition within the United States to Kissinger's surrender schemes in the Caribbean, a new Rockefeller pressure group, "The Commission on U.S.-Latin American Relations" was launched in mid-1974 (a few months after Secretary Kissinger signed the "statement of principles" with Panama's Marxist dictator), to marshal public support for our planned retreat. The commission is financed by grants from—would you believe?—the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Ford Foundation, the Clark Foundation, and David Rockefeller's Center for Inter-American Affairs.

The Commission promptly unveiled its own program for peace in Central America. The major plank, of course, was a call for a new treaty with Panama in which the United States would cancel all claims to ownership of the Canal.

When this Rockefeller-Kissinger giveaway scheme encountered heavy opposition in 1975, not only from the public but also from Congress, the Rockefeller Commission came up with a new wrinkle to the basic surrender plan the Shadow Government had been following. The new scheme, which was designed to sidestep opposition from the Congress, called for the United States to continue to use the land and facilities in Panama, and pay for them, but to transfer jurisdiction to Panama. Since the deal would not involve any sale or transfer of U.S. property, Congress would be left out of the negotiation—and the U.S. would retain an empty title. This Rockefeller-designed gambit is probably behind Kissinger's convoluted explanation of our new policy regarding Panama:

"The U.S. is seeking to establish a new and mutually acceptable relationship between our two countries whereby the U.S. can continue operating and defending the canal for a reasonably extended period of time. A new treaty would enable the U.S. to devote its energies to the efficient operation and control of the waterway and would leave other matters to the Panamanians."

Translate that to read: We'll arrange it so that Uncle Sap—I mean, Sam—will continue to pay all the bills. But we'll make sure that when the chips are down, it will be our Comrades in Panama—and Moscow—who will determine which ships pass through and which ones don't.

What would the loss of American jurisdiction over the Panama Canal mean? First would be the devastating diplomatic consequences of yet another collapse of American power and authority. But there is a far more serious aspect of Henry K's two-pronged campaign to legitimize Communism in Cuba and to surrender our sovereignty over the Panama Canal.

As we reported earlier, the Soviet Navy now surpasses the U.S. Navy. It virtually controls the Mediterranean and Indian Oceans, and, through the Soviet conquests in Africa, is becoming dominant in the Atlantic. Should part of the price for Kissinger's *detente* mean the loss of both the Panama Canal and the U.S. base on Guantanamo, the stage would be set for the Communists to sever the connecting link between the U.S. Pacific fleet and our Atlantic forces. In effect, Kissinger's planned retreat in the Caribbean would extend the Soviet spheres of naval dominance from the Black Sea across the Atlantic to our very shores. It would leave all of Latin and South America unprotected and indefensible.

As Representative Daniel Flood has stated: "I do not see how the Kremlin itself could have prepared a more effective plan for causing confusion and chaos on the Isthmus than has been done by our treaty negotiators—a plan that is designed to assure the ultimate extinction of all United States authority with respect to any canal on the Isthmus."

Or to put it another way, Moscow's most important man in Latin America is not Fidel Castro; it's Henry Kissinger.

*Teddy Roosevelt, who maneuvered to get the canal built, later said: "The canal must not be internationalized. It is our canal; we built it; we fortified it, and we will not permit our enemies to use it in war. In times of peace, all nations shall use it alike, but in time of war our interest becomes dominant."

186TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that today is the 186th anniversary of the U.S. Coast Guard. As a strong supporter of the Coast Guard, the smallest and in many respects the most dynamic of our Armed Forces, I am pleased to take this opportunity to salute the Coast Guard and trace some of the more important events in its 186-year history.

The Revenue Marine, the forerunner of the modern Coast Guard, was created in 1790 at the recommendation of Alexander Hamilton, first Secretary of the Treasury. Originally charged with stamping out smuggling and piracy along the coasts of the United States, the Revenue Marine served as the Nation's only naval force until 1798. The service saw its first wartime activity from 1797 to 1800, when it cooperated with the Navy in fighting French privateers. The Revenue Marine

also fought during the War of 1812. In 1831, the service began its first winter cruising to aid seafarers and ships in distress. The name of the service was changed to the Revenue Cutter Service in 1863.

For many years, private organizations such as the Massachusetts Humane Society operated the only lifesaving services on the Atlantic coast. In 1937, Congress authorized the use of public vessels to cruise the coast in rough weather and help navigators in distress. The Government took over all privately operated lifesaving stations in 1871 and established the Lifesaving Service, operated by the Revenue Cutter Service. In 1878, the lifesaving service became an independent bureau of the Department of the Treasury. The Revenue Cutter and Lifesaving Services were combined as the U.S. Coast Guard in 1915.

In addition to its valuable humanitarian search and rescue mission, the Coast Guard also functions as part of the Armed Forces. In 1861, the cutter *Harriet Lane* fired the first shot from any vessel in the Civil War. The coastal patrols of this service contributed immeasurably to the Union victory in the Civil War.

In the two World Wars and the Korean and Vietnamese conflicts, the Coast Guard served valuable functions in coastal patrol, convoy duty, and amphibious operations.

The varied operations of the modern Coast Guard are exemplified in such enterprises as the operation of large icebreakers in the polar regions, the establishment of the distant early warning—DEW—radar line across that region, and enforcement of the 200-mile fishing limit under the Fish Management Act. All this in addition to the historical functions of coastal law enforcement in preventing drug traffic and smuggling.

Mr. Speaker, I could not help but mention that this year is the centennial celebration of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, a federally controlled professional institution for the training of young men—and as of this year, women—as career officers in the U.S. Coast Guard. The Academy offers a fine academic program including professional training in all phases of seamanship, gunnery, communications, engineering, and shipboard routine, and produces outstanding leaders to carry out the multitudinous duties of the modern Coast Guard.

Mr. Speaker, as ranking minority member of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, which oversees the budget of the Coast Guard, I have been acutely aware of the valuable service which the Coast Guard provides to our Nation.

I know that my colleagues join me in taking this opportunity to wish the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Academy well, to congratulate and commend them on their 186th and 100th anniversaries respectively, and to wish them many returns of years of continued dedicated service to this country.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ONE MAN'S BATTLE AGAINST OSHA

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the problem with Government bureaucrats is that they do not understand the real life problem of running a business, the necessity of producing viable products and services—and ultimately to providing employment.

OSHA bureaucrats have become especially notorious for their insensitivity to the situation of the small businessman by inundating him with mountains of useless and sometimes punitive requirements.

Almost daily we hear about bizarre incidents where unknowing Government employees harass businessmen so that they either comply with inane regulations, or are forced to close their doors. Not all are able financially to fight the system as the Maine manufacturer reported in last January's issue of Government Executive magazine.

I would urge all of my colleagues to consider the following courageous account of a small businessman who knew his rights and stood up for them.

The article follows:

ONE MAN'S BATTLE AGAINST OSHA

(By Raymond J. Larson)

Basically, Howard Dearborn wants to be left alone. He does not want the government coming around telling him what to do (he calls it "damn government meddling"); he does not care at all for the increasing regulation Uncle Sam exerts over the operation of his precision machine shop in rural Fryeburg, Maine.

He has, you might say, a healthy mistrust of big government, and he cannot resist taking a potshot at it now and then. For example, when Warner & Swasey, Cleveland, ran an advertisement recently, entitled "Memo to Washington: You'd Be Surprised What Most of Us Do Without—You Ought to Try It Sometime," he sent the president of W&S a letter which said:

"I sincerely agree that the relationship between the number of productive people in the United States and the number of unproductive people in government employed to regulate and harrass the productive few is to the point of alarm. The productive few are paying the unproductive many to regulate and harass them. Yet the government cannot seem to understand why we have inflation."

With such an attitude, when the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) announced that it was going to visit Dearborn's 18,000-sq. ft. plant last year, a collision was inevitable.

The fact that the collision took place on schedule is hardly news in itself. But its repercussions are still being felt, both by Dearborn and the federal government; and before everything is sifted out and settled, some hard questions about OSHA operations and its regulations will have to be answered.

Dearborn built the company that bears his name by designing and building special machinery for precision boring, honing and drilling of such difficult materials as beryllium, zirconium, titanium and stainless steel. His customers, most of them in the nuclear reactor field, send parts to his shop from all over the U.S.—sometimes reluctantly.

"If there were any place else for some of them to go other than way up here," he says, "they would. But there is no other place; we're it."

Because of his unique niche in metalworking, Dearborn has been free until now to turn his attention to those things that interest him most, such as the recent development of a new generation of machinery for making uniform-walled tubing.

But Robert McNeally's visit to Dearborn's plant June 24, 1974, changed all that. McNeally is a compliance officer of OSHA.

McNeally liked most of what he saw. He would later testify before the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission that "the plant is in good physical condition. The housekeeping is fine. There were a few violations noted of the code, but I believe the company is very safety conscious and is doing its best to comply."

But because of one of those "few violations"—"nonserious" is how McNeally himself characterized it in his citation—the OSHA compliance officer decided that Dearborn, Inc. was liable for a fine of $25. And on July 5, the U.S. Labor Dept. sent Dearborn a Notification of Proposed Penalty in which he was informed that Howard Dearborn, Inc. was liable for a $25 fine because it had "failed to replace welding electrode cable which has damaged insulation and exposed bare conductors."

Howard Dearborn wouldn't pay. Instead, he hired Attorney Thomas D. Shaffner, who on Aug. 20, 1974, filed a response with the Review Commission. It said, in part:

"At the outset it should be made abundantly clear that the respondent is as interested as OSHA in providing a safe and healthy environment for its employees. In fact, a great deal of time, energy and money is expended in this regard. A penalty is only useful as a deterrent to future conduct of the type for which the penalty was levied. Since the respondent is desirous of preventing any reoccurrence of the alleged unsafe condition, it wants the penalty to be levied against the person who created it and/or permitted it to exist. Thus the penalty must necessarily be levied against either the employee(s) actually using the welder or the foreman to whom the welders report or the superintendent of the plant.

"During the course of discussion of the alleged OSHA violation with the above described employees, however, it was learned that none of them knew of the subject OSHA regulation. If they had known of it, steps would have been taken to correct any deviation therefrom. To penalize a person for not knowing of a regulation of the U.S. government, without first advising such person, amounts to a violation of due process."

To make it clear that the violation itself was not the issue, Shaffner that same day notified T. R. Amirault, area director of the U.S. Dept. of Labor in Concord, N.H., that the "welding cable was actually replaced to alleviate any and all disputes with respect to the safety of its repaired condition."

On Oct. 29, 1974, a hearing was held in Portland, Me., before David J. Knight, administrative law judge for the Review Commission, and on June 26, 1975, Judge Knight issued his opinion. Knight found that the Dearborn plant "is in good physical condition, is safety conscious, and the compliance officer believes it does its best to comply with the regulations." But he went on to order that the $25 fine be enforced, saying that Dearborn, Inc., "was under obligation to advise its employees of the safe operations of the arc welding machinery" but failed to do so.

Dearborn still won't pay. "The first time I ever had anything to do with OSHA was the time the inspector came here," he says. "We

never saw any book of rules and regulations or anything else. We got fined for not knowing, even though they never told us in the first place. There are so many people passing laws these days you couldn't read them all in one lifetime.

"We got the impression that the fine might have been partly to help pay for sending the inspector here. So we offered to pay an inspection fee; we offered to pay OSHA $100 to come up here and inspect the place and find everything that's wrong. But as for this fine, I won't pay the damn thing. Paying it would make me a criminal and I'm no criminal. I'm a businessman trying to run an honest business."

Because he felt so strongly about it, Dearborn instructed Shaffner to file an appeal, even though it already had cost him more than $3,000 in legal fees.

Notes Shaffner, "We went to court, we lost and we've appealed. Don't get me wrong, I don't really think we're going to win. But even after we've exhausted all of our avenues of apepal, the government still has to collect the $25. And that isn't going to be easy."

Shaffner says the government will have to put a lien on Dearborn's plant here and even sell it if it is serious about collecting the fine. "It isn't the money," he says, "it's the principle."

Will it really come to that?

"I won't pay it," insists Dearborn. "Someone has to change the system, and I guess that means us."

ARMS OUT OF CONTROL

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, nearly every major newspaper in the country has taken note of the burgeoning American arms sales throughout the world, and particularly, to the Persian Gulf. The American people have begun to realize that these sales too often promote instability, not security, or peace. Nevertheless, the administration and its sophisticated sales forces at the State Department and the Pentagon continue to promote excessive weapons transactions.

The figures, Mr. Speaker, indicate that military sales have gone berserk. In 1974, nearly 60 percent of all U.S. foreign military sales—$6.4 billion worth—were to Persian Gulf states. In 1975, Persian Gulf FMS amounted to $4.5 billion—half of our total sales. In the last 5 years, Saudi Arabia alone has spent $9 billion on American military purchases, and Iran has spent $10.4 billion.

The recent Senate Foreign Relations Committee study on American arms sales to Iran has demonstrated that these sales threaten to involve the United States directly in Iranian conflicts. It should, by now, be clear that such massive military support does not end with delivery of the hardware or construction of the facilities. Our repeated military sales threaten to create de facto commitments which the Congress has not approved and the people do not support.

Despite growing concern over its insatiable quest for arms sales, the administration is negotiating additional—and even more dangerous—transactions. An unprecedented $13 billion sale of destroyers and supersonic fighters to Iran is reportedly in the final stages. The administration is, at the same time, attempting to sell 2,000 Sidewinder air-to-air missiles to Saudi Arabia, along with an as yet undertermined number of Maverick air-to-surface missiles, TOW wire-guided missiles, and laser-guilded bombs. These are not outmoded weapons which the Pentagon needs to dump; these are among the newest and most sophisticated equipment in the U.S. arsenal. It seems that each arms sale to an oil-rich sheikdom is followed by more sales to others on the grounds that a strategic balance must be maintained. The administration seems unable to say "no."

Mr. Speaker, our foreign military sales policy will become a matter of much debate in the House in the coming months. A perceptive editorial on the gulf arms race appeared in yesterday's Christian Science Monitor, and I encourage my colleagues to consider it.

The editorial follows:

ARMS OUT OF CONTROL

It is encouraging that public attention has begun to focus on the spiraling of American arms sales abroad. Congress, for one, is watching this development like a hawk. But the fact remains that there is yet no serious effort within the government to look at what is being sold all over the world and to evolve a sensible policy for bringing arms sales under control. The new administration will have to give this matter the highest priority.

It should be no source of pride to the United States that it has become the largest arms seller in the world. Government-to-government exports totaled about $1.5 billion annually a decade ago; the level is now a staggering $9 billion to $10 billion a year. Moreover, the U.S. is no longer peddling hand-me-downs but the newest and highly advanced weapon systems, such as supersonic planes, submarines, and antiship missiles.

Ironically, the United States may be defeating its own goal of enhancing security throughout the world. Not only does this massive out-pouring of arms fuel possibilities for regional conflict. As military and diplomatic experts are beginning to realize, and with some alarm, it will become increasingly difficult for the U.S.—or the Soviet Union—to play the role of peacemaker. The ability of the superpowers to maintain world stability is thus being eroded.

Iran is an illustration of the dangers of unrestrained arms selling. A just-released study by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee notes that the Iranians do not even have the skills to operate the sophisticated U.S. weaponry they now have and would be totally dependent on U.S. personnel if they decided to go to war. By 1980, the report estimates, there could be as many as 50,000 Americans in Iran involved mostly in arms programs.

It is doubly disturbing that there has been no close scrutiny of this program because of a secret decision by President Nixon in 1972 to sell Iran all the modern conventional arms it wanted. When one considers the volatility of the Middle East and the potential for wars and oil embargoes in the region, it is astonishing the U.S. has such an open-ended commitment.

Other arms programs are equally questionable. The Saudi Arabians are asking for as many as 2,000 Sidewinder interceptor missiles for the F–5s, when experts agree such a number is excessive for the country's defense. Fortunately, as a result of public outcry, the administration will probably scale down its arms request to Congress.

Nor is the Persian Gulf the only turbulent area where arms are accumulating at fast rate. An arms race is under way in black Africa, where the United States is eager to bolster its allies and counter the Soviet arms buildup in Somalia, Uganda, and Angola. And many "third-world" countries are acquiring submarines and missile-armed patrol boats that could be used to impede shipping.

This is not to suggest a criticism of legitimate arms programs. It makes sense for the U.S. to help friendly countries build up their forces so they can defend themselves. There is merit in fostering regional defense systems. Arms agreements often serve valid security objectives—perhaps they do in most cases.

But to accept the present government view of "the more the better" (and the Pentagon, especially, argues that arms sales help the balance of trade and keep unit costs down) is to head down a potentially dangerous path. Some hard thought ought to be given to the nature of the weapons supplied. Are the most lethal arms going to unreliable clients? To what extent are they truly defensive? If they can be used as offensive weapons, what quantity can be justified as needed?

Arms are like shiny toys these days. Everyone wants them. But, as the major supplier in the world, the United States ought to take the lead in showing that it does not intend to turn the world into an arsenal of weapons that could have disastrous consequences.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, August 5, 1976*

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.—Galatians 6: 7.

O God of light and life as we bow at this noontide altar make us conscious of Thy presence and may we hear Thy still, small voice speaking to our waiting hearts. Amid all the changes and the confusion of these demanding days give us the faith to feel that Thou art with us all the way.

Keep us discontented with things as they are and help us to be a part of the change for good in our Nation and in our world. May we see the glory of the coming of the Lord as we struggle for brotherhood, for justice, for peace, and for good will among all people.

Help us to be true to the highest we know and responsive to the challenge to be our best and to do our best for our country and for Thee.

"I would live ever in the light.
I would work ever for the right.
I would serve Thee with all my might,
therefore, to Thee I come."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.